THEOLOGY

VOL. LXII NOVEMBER, 1959 No. 473

Editorial

THE death of the first editor of THEOLOGY has been quickly followed by that of the second, Spencer Cecil Carpenter. Dr Carpenter succeeded Dr Selwyn in January 1934, and handed over to the present editor, a former pupil of his, in January 1939. His editorship was particularly distinguished by the wisdom and felicity of his editorials: would that he had been able to hand on those and other rare qualities that he possessed! A review of his last book appears elsewhere in this number. Dr Carpenter served the Church of England with convinced and convincing devotion, as parish priest, theological teacher, Master of the Temple, Dean of Exeter, and not at least as its historian. May he rest in peace.

* * * * *

The prospect of the Roman Council is likely to produce a spate of books. It is not likely to produce a better one than Dr Jaroslav Pelikan's *The Riddle of Roman Catholicism* (Abingdon Press, New York, $4). Dr Pelikan is a Lutheran and the primary aim of his book is to enlighten American Protestants about what Roman Catholicism is really like. But it is so well-informed and so eirenic, and written with such sympathy and penetration, as to be useful to a much wider public. Dr Pelikan's theological perspective is that of Paul Tillich, which is to say that he has a finer sense of proportion than most writers on the relationship between Roman Catholicism and Protestantism. He realizes the complexity of his subject, but succeeds in doing justice to all its aspects. This is not a polemical "dissuasive from popery", but a book for anyone who wants to understand the Roman Church as it has been in the past and as it is now, who is prepared to lay aside prejudice, and who is open to genuine dialogue. The book ought to be made available in an English edition.

* * * * *

A correspondent, writing to us about prayers "after the third collect", says that in some churches "six or seven prayers are rattled off at far too great a speed. The clergyman often fidgets with books, the prayers are often unprepared, and he is caught out by unobserved punctuation." So far as our own experience goes, much more care is given by the clergy to the use of this period of common prayer than used to be the case. Biddings and silence are wholesomely varied with spoken prayers, and praise and thanksgiving with intercession. When spoken prayers are used, we believe many congregations would find that a small number (not more than three or four), read carefully and with pauses between them, can more

easily be prayed with full attention than the larger number that in many churches seems to be considered necessary. Certainly the prayers should be selected beforehand with an eye to the theme of the rest of the service. In this connexion, we are glad to report that *Daily Prayer* (edited by Eric Milner-White and G. W. Briggs) has now been published as a Pelican Book for 3s. 6d. It was first published in 1941, and we do not know of any better collection of prayers, whether for public or private use.

* * * * *

Autres temps autres mœurs. "We regret very much to perceive that the Queen has permitted Mrs Ellis's 'Wives of England' (Fisher) to be dedicated to her. The author is well known to be the wife of a dissenting preacher; and the book itself, we are quite sure, is of that class which her Majesty, as a mother, had she seen it before the permission was given, would least like to have herself connected with. For, to say nothing of the false principles with which it abounds, we can scarcely conceive anything more hurtful to the young mind of a female—and the book is intended for the young—or more injurious to delicacy of feeling, than to have the thoughts constantly directed towards matrimony. Girls are not usually found too slow in speculating on this subject of themselves; but for parents and teachers to be putting it into their heads, appears to us the height of folly. Let mothers give their daughters a good sound general education, and there will be no fear of their turning out bad 'wives'."—*The Christian Remembrancer,* June, 1843, pp. 821 f.

Sin and Infant Baptism

THE sin historically and otherwise relevant in infant baptism is that called "original", but this cannot be usefully considered in isolation from actual sin and moral evil. The following points are, of course, no more than brief summary statements such as I think must be given weight unless thought is to go astray. Throughout I assume that a horror of sin is at the root of Christianity and that no more serious charge can be brought against any type of religious belief than that it promotes moral indifference.

Sin is a theological term and has no proper usage in an ethical system in which God has no place and in which man's relation to him is not fundamental. I agree with Prof. Burnaby's words: "The displacement of Law by the Grace of our Lord Jesus Christ renders obsolete all account of sin conceived in terms of pure ethics"; and also that sin "is resistance to the Spirit of God—what the Bible calls 'grieving the Spirit' ".[1] But in superseding law, grace does not demoralize sin or abolish ethics.

[1] THEOLOGY, January 1959, p. 12.

Christian theology of sin has been inconsistent and confused. St Paul is not always clear as between two Jewish theories—that Adam's transgression produced human sinfulness, and that sin is rooted in our fleshly nature.[1] Teaching has differed according to the weight attached to dogmatic, ethical or philosophical interests. Augustine gives examples of many theories. His own view is that evil is a fundamentally perverted will, originating from the freely incurred guilt of Adam, and this has been widely accepted but often without the notion of total depravity; though it can be objected that if free will is the cause of evil it is also the cause of good and that man is not in utter need of grace, which is Pelagianism.[2]

It cannot be denied that the exceptionally intense spiritual and mental conflicts of Paul, Augustine, Luther and others have produced an emphasis upon human depravity and a sense of a continuous terrible strife against gigantic forces of evil imposed upon all men.[3] To many this is unhealthily depressing and to many more unreal. Beyond doubt the depravity and the terrible conflicts do occur, but I do not believe that the common human or even Christian experience supports the view of a continuous dreadful conflict or tension; it often does not do so in the direst human circumstances. The struggle against temptation, even fortified by divine grace, is hard enough; but it has not, with the vast majority of mankind, the fearsome and tragic aspect with which theologians have often clothed it. When this is done after long years of Christian life, theologians are either admitting the ineffectiveness of divine grace or else writing about the words of others rather than of their own experience. The Christian vision of God does indeed convict of deep-seated sin, but its glory is the promise and hope of its conquest.

Theology has regarded sin as defect, transgression, rebellion, a hereditary taint, or as some or all of these combined. As for its essence or root, this has been said to be sensuality, pride, selfishness, delusion or disease. All of these express aspects of truth; but the clearest form of sin is pride, which both Augustine and Aquinas say is the beginning of sin, and pride "when it has come to maturity" is self-deification, self-chosen independence of God.

Our Lord expounded no theory of sin or of its origin. He says little about sin except in relation to repentance and forgiveness. To become as little children is a condition of entry into the kingdom of God. If on the Cross he experienced alienation from God it was, in the universal judgment of Christians since, when he completed the doing of his Father's will; but there is little if anything about such alienation in his teaching. Inferences are uncertain and dangerous, but if we make them, I think our Lord's view of sin is more akin

[1] The combination of the two is artificial and issues in contradictions.

[2] It is worth repeating that to hold that our birth-condition ought not to be called "sin" does not logically require deduction of the Pelagian premise that man is not in utter need of grace.

[3] The other balancing fact is that the sense of the sinfulness of sin deepens with the increasing vision of holiness, which is why the natural man often regards the saints as unhealthily preoccupied with sin when he can see so little sin in their lives.

with the Greek theory (though in no degree indebted to it) that its source is delusion or a perverted condition of mind: sinners are lost, gone astray, or are blind, in a state of being content to walk by the light they happen to have without concern as to whether that light is not darkness. But he seems to have attached far greater importance to what men were good for than what they are bad for, more concerned with the possibilities of virtue than with the avoidance of sin. And most of the later theological language about sin will continue to appear absurd if used of the delinquencies of children or even of the faults of which sincere adult Christians are conscious. Whatever our birth-condition, it is only when self-will and selfishness are accepted as principles of action by the mind and in our willing that such words as "rebellion", "revolt", "self-deification" have any meaning as referring to actualities.

Nevertheless, the universal natural birth-condition which is unnecessarily and erroneously (as I think) described as "original sin" is fact confirmed by experience. Babies, so far as we can judge, have no self-consciousness, knowledge or conscious volition. But when moral consciousness is attained we find already present a tendency to lawlessness, the source of which is plainly racial rather than individual or personal. It makes no whit of difference *to the fact* whether the cause of it is a "fall" or consequent upon the ascent of man from an earlier condition; but in these days the latter should be frankly accepted, with its implications, as alone based on anything that can be called knowledge, whether certain or probable. The *condition*, being prior to self-consciousness, is manifestly inherited, not subsequently acquired; quite independently of any theological dogma, it has an indisputably adequate psychological basis. But in accounting for it and characterizing it, we must choose between the biblical and the modern scientific stories of the early history of mankind: attempts to combine the two issue in monstrosities and needless irresolvable perplexities. The doctrine of baptism and its significance, in the baptism of infants, is directly involved. The main difficulty is that unavoidable natural inheritance, however real and serious, cannot properly be designated by the same *noun* (sin), as actions or a resulting condition for which a person is responsible, accountable, and of which he is guilty. It is impossible to describe racial inheritance as *sin* without diminishing personal responsibility for sin; and as it is recognized that to diminish personal responsibility can only be both spiritually and morally disastrous, the result of the attempt to combine them is evasion, verbal quibbling, and unconvincing muddle.

In this matter Protestant or Reformed theology is in worse case than Roman Catholic. The latter has its doctrine of original sin, regarded as "mysterious" (as in the light of modern knowledge indeed it is). The Council of Trent[1] declares that Adam "poured sin, which is the death of the soul, into the whole human race", and

[1] *Decret. de Peccato Orig.* It makes no difference whether "Adam" is regarded as an individual or stands as a symbol for the earliest truly human progenitors of the race.

thereby lost original justice or righteousness both for himself and for us. But the Council condemns the notion that original sin destroyed free will and made man incapable of good actions. Roman theology agrees with our Anglican Article that we are conceived and born in sin and the children of wrath. This, however, is because we are left without the grace to reach that *supernatural* end which God intended. The remission of this "sin" therefore "consists in being transplanted into Jesus Christ as the Just one, and the Author of all justice". Thus original sin consists in deprivation of original righteousness, not in depravity of human nature as God intended it to be. The rebellion of the senses is a consequence of the fall, but is *not* original sin or in itself a sin at all. God has not deprived us of anything proper to our nature without actual guilt on our part, but of a grace which is no part of human nature. We have no claim to possess it nor ground of complaint if God takes it away. Since Adam's sin, God infuses souls deprived of original righteousness, and as infusion follows by natural law on bodily generation, *in that sense* human propagation is the cause of original sin.

The difficulty about this is that in modern usage "original righteousness" (like "original *sin*" if predicated of any but the first sinner) is neither true nor false but meaningless. Righteousness, as distinct from innocence or mechanical correctness, cannot conceivably be created ready-made: it must be an *achievement*, alike as by grace as (if that were possible) otherwise. There is not a shred of evidence that man was ever perfect, free from sin, disease and death, or that human nature was ever, being sustained by unmerited grace, other than it now is: the notion would have vanished from civilized society had it not been believed to be guaranteed by divinely revealed information. If belief in God can be sustained only on the hypothesis that his original creation was something different from that of which alone we have any knowledge, the inevitable outcome will be not belief in such an original different creation, but disbelief in God.

There has long been disquiet, recently greatly increased, about infant baptism in the Church of England. It is mainly due "to the persistent survival in our de-Christianized society of the custom of bringing babies to church to be 'christened', although the parents have no serious desire or intention that they shall be Christianly brought up". I doubt if there has been any very extensive change in the attitude of parents: the clergy have become, and rightly, more sensitive about it. Some think the deplorable state of affairs can be remedied by refusing to baptize infants where there is no reasonable hope that they will be brought up as the children of Christian parents should be or that the promises made by sponsors, on which baptism is administered, will or can be carried out. I am sure that this proposed remedy will effect little, and that such discrimination by the clergy will provoke bitterness and resentment, and desertion from even nominal membership of the Church wherever attempts are made to practise it. Nor can I see any justification for it so long as the Church refuses to revise her *doctrine* underlying the baptism

of infants, or else ceases to administer infant baptism. Indeed, as things are, the Church is herself more blameworthy for the existing condition of affairs than parents who act as the Church deplores; for the Church has, or should have, the greater intelligence. This criticism requires justification; here it is (I italicize the indefensible language):

> "Original Sin . . . *is the fault and corruption of the Nature of every man, that is naturally engendered of the off-spring of Adam* . . . and therefore in every person born into this world, *it deserveth God's wrath and damnation.*"
>
> From the Rites of the Public and Private Baptism of Infants: "*Forasmuch as all men are conceived and born in sin,*" etc.; that the child "*being delivered from thy wrath*", and "*coming to thy holy Baptism, may receive remission of his sins*"; "*to release him of his sins*"—(note the plurals); and the rubric "that children which are baptized, *dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved*"—which implies a serious doubt about the fate of children who die without baptism—that Baptism be not deferred "*longer than the first or second Sunday after their birth*"—the 1928 revision extends the permissive deferment to "the fourth, or at furthest the fifth, Sunday unless upon a great and reasonable cause"—both directions being more commonly ignored than observed; and children privately baptized, if later brought to church to be received into the Church, are said to have been "*born in original sin, and in the wrath of God*" (the last six words may be omitted according to 1928);

and the urgency of baptism is so great that if no minister is available in cases of extreme urgency, anyone having the use of reason may sufficiently baptize, provided water is used and the baptism is in the name of the Trinity.

Such statements, if believed, not only justify infant baptism but imperatively require it as of urgent necessity, whether or not the child survives and whether or not there is hope that he will be Christianly brought up. So long as such doctrine stands, nothing can justify refusal to baptize if baptism is asked for or desired. On the contrary, for such persons who can believe these absurdities, the only logical course is to advocate compulsory baptism of infants; and, in fact, large numbers of people who bring infants to be baptized, if asked why they do so, would be able to say no more than that if there is any good in the Rite, the child may as well have it, so as to be on the safe side. But can any person in his senses to-day believe that unless unself-conscious, not rationally volitional but purely instinctive, babies are dipped in water with an accompanying formula, they are liable to God's wrath and damnation, which otherwise they deserve? It is no longer a matter for argument: the ordinary movement of the mind has removed such notions beyond the range of credibility. However firmly one may believe in the objectivity of sacramental grace received through Sacraments, if they are effective *ex opere operato* without conscious co-operation or even awareness of what is happening, there is no reason why infants should not also be given Holy Communion or why we should not revive the superstition of baptism on behalf of the dead.

The recent proposals of the Liturgical Commission rightly take adult baptism as "the norm" for the doctrine of baptism. But adult

baptism is not the norm in practice. In their proposed Rite of Infant Baptism the Commissioners omit all reference to the remission of sin or sins, except in the Blessing of the Water, in which "Sanctify . . . to the mystical washing away of sin" remains. As the Commissioners were not asked and had no authority to revise the doctrine of baptism, they could hardly have done either more or less than they have done. Their proposed Rite is an immense improvement and should not be rejected on grounds of disagreement in detail.[1] What would be incredible, were it not a fact, is that while a weighty body of scholars proposes such a revised Rite, the Church of England, in her present revision of the Canons, is intending to re-assert that the Thirty-nine Articles may not only be assented to, but "may be subscribed unto *with a good conscience* by all members of the Church of England". I can understand that they may be assented to in the sense that it is not desired to forbid anyone who can assent to all the statements in them to do so, but I think anyone who can do this "with a good conscience" as expressing his own belief, either does not know what he is doing or, if he does know it, does not know whether or not that which he is doing is right or wrong.

The dilemma is this. The Church knows only *one* baptism, and it is "baptism for the remission of sins". This is not the whole doctrine of baptism, which includes, as the Liturgical Commission so rightly says, that Christ will give to the baptized by divine power a new and heavenly birth, receive them into his Church, sanctify them and give them strength; but baptism which does not *include* "the remission of sins" is not Christian baptism, and this, in the case of infants, is meaningless. Nothing is further apart than heaven and hell than actions for which I am responsible, accountable and guilty, and a condition which I inherit by the fact of being born. To use the same term for both is indefensible and will and can only lead to endless confusion. Infants cannot resist or "grieve" the Spirit of God, and therefore need neither forgiveness nor remission of sins or of sin. I do not accept N. P. Williams's mythological doctrine of a pre-mundane fall or that original sin consists in a deficiency of herd instinct,[2] but I think he was right in perceiving that anything in our birth-inheritance belongs to the wider and dark problem of evil and needs no *special* explanation in its manifestation in man. It is of a piece with the appalling misfits and the ferocities of Nature, which are not to be accounted for by any theories of sin. In view of what we know of man's origins, what is mis-called "original sin" was too probable not to happen, as William Temple said. It must therefore take its place in the will of God. But if so, its inclusion in the will of God must also mean its eventual suppression and transmutation

[1] Personally I regret the substitution of Matt. 28. 18–20 for Mark 10. 13–16 as the Gospel, which is made on the ground that the latter passage "has no obvious connexion with Baptism". It certainly has no connexion with a baptism "for the remission of sins", but it has great relevance to the only purposes for the baptism of infants.

[2] Indeed, in modern conditions, even in the Church, the less of this anyone has, the better!

I think the Liturgical Commission's Rite should serve well for an interim period of great difficulty. But I am sure that the only satisfactory and final solution is not to baptize infants but to receive them into the Church as catechumens, postponing baptism, and thus by clearly linking it with Confirmation and first Communion, making it the actual instead of only the ideal norm of baptism, alike in doctrine and practice, by restoring it as one part of a threefold initiatory rite. This could not be done without long preparation by careful teaching. But nothing else can remedy the present most unsatisfactory state of affairs. To maintain the present *doctrine* of the Prayer Book, while declining to minister baptism to all infants whose parents ask for it, and refusing it to such as are unfortunate enough not to have parents ready to carry out the baptismal promises, is comparable only with the desperate pessimism which, faced with two evils, chooses both.

J. S. Bezzant.

Where Liturgical Revision Should Begin

Among the urgent matters requiring the thoughtful attention of churchmen none is more urgent than the marked disinclination of the great majority of the population to "go to church" except on rare occasions. This disinclination is shared by all classes, though it is most marked among the manual workers. The reasons for this are several, and not all of them are obscure. But the fact is for all to see in town and country. The remedy will not be quick; and it may be a generation or more before the tide changes the country over.

Living in a society which, however polite it is to the clergy and even appreciative of good pastoral work, has apparently no use for what the Church has to offer, Christians who do attend churches need to be greatly fortified by their Sunday worship to stand to their faith and witness. A conventional or dutiful habit, or a service with only the quality of "the usual routine" will not serve them. What goes forward must engage their whole personality in a lively way. The stranger who strays in, however little he may comprehend, should at least be able to recognize that these people are fully engaged in an activity that means a lot to them—hungry people being fed; receiving food and nourishment they value highly, losing themselves a little and for a little while in contemplation and adoration and finding solace to carry them (with their chins up) through the duties and relationships of the next six days. Not the consolations of pious escapism, but the comfort of the Holy Spirit, which brings faith and courage as well as peace. It cannot of course be like that every Sunday even if one could always be tuned to the right key. There is cumulative value in a good habit quite independently of any immediate emotional response. Preachers who want to convert their congregations once a week can be as boring as those who do not seem to want to convert anybody about anything at any time. Allowing

for all that, we are in most churches too content just to turn a handle, too content with sheer mediocrity and dullness, not only in the pulpit, where we cannot always help ourselves, but in the prayer-desk and in the sanctuary. And many of the practitioners in dullness are too content to grasp the provided handle without any reflection other than gratitude that it is handily at hand.

This is not an open invitation to every incumbent and curate of the Church of England to indulge his own liturgical whimsies if he has any. Some of the laity have been driven away by that sort of thing already. But it is a demand that reform in liturgical practice, and if needs be revision in liturgical form, should begin with and concentrate upon the Sunday worship in the ordinary church for ordinary folk. It means that in liturgical revision we should not allow attention to be deflected by secondary or scholastic considerations from what is being done and not being done in our churches; and from what might and should be done in order that the worship may be so truly directed as to evoke response and to speak to the condition of contemporary man. The more firmly we believe that worship and prayer, truly informed and directed, are needful for the health of individual and of society, the more should the Church at all levels be putting its mind to the normal worship on the Sundays of the Christian Year. It is partly, but only partly, a problem of communication, and that at a deeper level than those who bother unduly about obsolete words always recognize. It certainly is not simply a matter of conforming quickly to the changing fashions of the hour, in music, art or liturgy.

From this brief introduction let me pass to some explicit criticisms and proposals.

1. Are we making full, intelligent use of the existing resources provided by the Book of Common Prayer, the Bible and by our church buildings? No, we are not.

2. The failure is primarily lack of preparation on the part both of priest and of congregation.

The priest, minimally, needs only to open the Book on the prayer-desk and read out what is therein printed, and go to the lectern and after consulting the lectionary read from the Book there the appointed lesson. If what is written in both Books is to come alive and evoke response, he and others must give preparatory thought and care to the ordering of the service. And yet even if the priest does, and is also entering himself meaningfully into what he is saying and doing, his efforts will be defeated so long as the other people in the church have come there quite unprepared for what they are going to say and listen to.

It is sadly the case that very many churchgoers to-day arrive at the Sunday act of worship in a non-conforming state without having given a thought beforehand to the service in which they are going to take part and without a glance into their Prayer Book (if they have one). And as the Prayer Book is arranged it takes more than a passing glance to get from it what it has to give.

It is noteworthy that on the great festivals people do not come

quite so unprepared, for they at least know it is Christmas or Easter or Whitsun, and that is one reason why the services on these days evoke response. The other reason why the worshipper may feel or say on these days "it has been a good service", is because on these days the several parts and pieces cohere. A unifying theme holds together hymns, psalms, lections, prayers and sermon.

This leads to the point I wish to drive home. Whereas on a great festival the worshipper feels that the service is a good service, and the chief reason is that it "hangs together", so often on other Sundays as things are ordered the parts do not hang together. The result on the man in the pew in consequence tends to be lack of interest, no lively response, boredom.

Of course, basically, the theme of every act of worship is one and the same, but the matter cannot be left like that. Most of us in things spiritual have weak digestions. We cannot stomach a richly mixed grill. If there is no obvious connexion between the lessons, the psalms, the hymns and the sermon, or if they have no obvious connexion with the Collect, Epistle and Gospel, the diet is too mixed; and if the psalms should be badly sung and the lessons carelessly read the confusion is worse confounded.

This argument for thematic unity is strengthened by one element in the appeal of "the Parish Communion". One reason, undoubtedly, why an increasing number of "the faithful" confine their churchgoing to "the Parish Communion", apart from the value of the Sacrament itself and its corporateness, is that the act of worship *coheres*. Even if the Epistle and Gospel are inaudible, or when audible difficult to comprehend and seemingly unrelated, the emphasis of the rite on offering and communion is clear, strong and satisfying.

My first plea, therefore, is that before Convocation accepts another selection of psalms for Sundays, or asks for another lectionary in place of the present unsatisfactory one, the Church should approve the principle of choosing an over-arching, or unifying, theme for the several Sundays in Lent, Epiphany and after Trinity, and in so doing should select the dynamic doctrines of the faith as well as the great events and the Christian way of life. Then having so chosen, psalms and lections should be selected appropriate to the theme. The individual priest would then be the more encouraged to fit hymns, occasional prayers and sermon into the pattern, contriving a rational variety in contrast to the irrational variety by which we are so often distracted as things are. This is already possible on some Sundays in the year, but quite impossible on others. And it will remain impossible so long as the appointed psalms and lections, and the Epistle and Gospel have no relation to one another. On many Sundays there is no sort of unifying theme either at Mattins or Evensong: and not always in the ante-Communion, for sometimes it requires a subtlety of mind, which most of us have not got, to perceive the unifying thought of the Collect, Epistle and Gospel. Moreover, the Epistles are often difficult, and selection of Gospel readings is not as good as it might be. Anyone can see this for himself if he looks up the ap-

pointed psalms and lessons together with the Proper for some of the Sundays in Lent or after Trinity.

My second plea is that the laity in the pews should be helped to come prepared, and to know how to use their Prayer Book. Fifteen years ago "A Shorter Prayer Book" was designed and published in order to make available in the pews a book in which the more occasional worshipper might find his way quickly and follow the service easily, provided the priest was standing to his Declaration of Assent. It has served a useful purpose. But there is another and complementary need to be met. The worshipper also needs an aid for a more leisurely and private use of the Prayer Book, and the Bible in association with it. A pattern for this is the layman's *missel*, published in many countries and in various forms for use in the Roman Catholic Church. One such recently published in France, and from our standpoint and for our imitation much the best, is *Missel Biblique*, prepared by a group under the direction of Canon Boulard and reflecting the Liturgical Reform movement in the French Church. It is well arranged and beautifully printed. Anything similar in relation to the Book of Common Prayer, and especially to a Book of Common Prayer in process of revision, woud be a difficult undertaking, but it could in measure be done, and it should be done.

3. There is a third reform or enrichment of our Sunday worship which need not await Prayer Book revision, as such, but could be done at diocesan level with the authority of the Ordinary. The increasing emphasis on "the Parish Communion" as *the* Sunday service for the faithful—even to the unfortunate extent of decrying Mattins and Evensong—is resulting in many younger churchmen being unfamiliar with the psalms and canticles and with the Bible, especially the Old Testament and the Apocrypha. If this were to continue it would be an irreparable loss. The Bible has been the book of the English people and the psalter the book of private devotions for English churchmen over four great centuries of their history. Mattins and Evening Prayer, the Litany and the regular reading of the Bible in church have made succeeding generations familiar with Holy Scripture, Christian doctrine and prayer. This has fashioned our distinctive spiritual culture and way of life. Can some part of Mattins or Evening Prayer be used as a preparation for the Holy Communion without overloading it and obscuring the emphasis on offering and communion? This did happen when, as used to be the custom, Holy Communion merely followed on from Mattins, even if the transition is made after *Benedictus*, which, focusing as it does on John the Baptist, is nearly as unsuitable an introit as *Nunc Demittis* would be to an evening Eucharist.

If, however, there were a more selective use of Mattins (or Evensong), and the psalm, Old Testament Lesson and Canticle chosen for each Sunday made a clear sequence of thought and prayer leading into the Proper for the Day, this ought not to dim the high lights of the Eucharist or weary the congregation.

The alternative, so long as churchmen only go to church once on Sunday, is an impoverishment of their spiritual life and of their

sound understanding of the Bible and the Christian faith and life, which we cannot afford.

As in these things example is better than precept and experiment is essential, I hope to work out these suggestions with the help of a small group as applied to a number of Sundays; and if we are fairly satisfied perhaps publish for wider experiment.

In conclusion, I would only add that it will not be possible to use either the psalms or the Old Testament in this intimate association with Eucharistic worship without being more drastic in the omission of verses than the compilers of Anglican lectionaries and selections of psalms have yet been—equally in the matter of translation where the Coverdale mystique has been allowed too much sway.

LESLIE SHEFFIELD.

The Frontiers of Humanism

"It's a poor sort of memory," said the Queen in *Alice*, "which only works backwards." And, in the study of words, we may be too quick to look back into history. But the time has surely arrived to take stock of the current use of the term "Humanism", in the light of its history. Sir Julian Huxley writes of "evolutionary Humanism",[1] Mrs Margaret Knight of "scientific Humanism",[2] and the leader-writer of *The Church of England Newspaper* of "liberal Humanism".[3] Mr Hector Hawton, in his pamphlet *Humanism Explained*, uses the word by itself. His opening sentence reads, "Humanism is the outcome of a rejection of the belief in supernatural revelation." The Oxford University Humanist Society states that it exists "to stimulate a free and independent criticism of religious views of life and to promote the constructive alternative of Humanism".[4] And Mr J. B. Coates says, "I offer humanism (or rationalism—the terms are virtually synonymous) as a constructive alternative to Christianity."[5]

Furthermore, contemporary writers on humanism themselves make an appeal to history. Mr Hawton, for example, says that humanism is "older than Christianity"; and he cites Confucius as "the outstanding example of the founder of an ethical religion which did not rest upon supernatural sanctions".[6] Mr Coates refers to the "highly significant Greek humanism" of Pericles's Funeral Oration, and of Epicurus.[7]

The history of the word "Humanism" takes us back into some of the most formative periods of European thought. It includes a charter of meanings as broad as "man's unconquerable mind". This

---

[1] *Religion without Revelation*, chapter 9.
[2] *Morals without Religion, and other Essays*, page 19.
[3] *C.E.N.*, 24 December 1958, page 2.
[4] *Oxford Vade Mecum.*, Michaelmas Term, 1958, page 8.
[5] *A Challenge to Christianity*, page 9.
[6] *Humanism Explained*, page 2.
[7] *A Challenge to Christianity*, page 15.

is what we should expect, for it is what the word itself implies. The 1952 edition of Funk and Wagnall's New Standard Dictionary lists these varieties of meaning:

> 1. Human nature; humanity.
> 2. Culture derived from classical training and the cultivation of the polite branches of knowledge; also, the humanities; polite learning.
> 3. A system of thinking in which man, his interests and development, are made central and dominant. Its tendency is to exalt the cultural and practical rather than the scientific and speculative, and to encourage a spirit of revolt against existing opinions. Specifically:
> (1) The literary movement of the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth centuries which, following the impulse of Petrarch, revolted against scholasticism, exalted Greek culture and classical models, and was the chief influence in bringing about the Renaissance.
> (2) Recently, and less properly, the revival of the doctrine that, since "man is the measure of all things", there is no existence or truth not relative to human faculties and needs. Agnosticism with regard to the absolute and infinite follows as a necessary logical consequence. . . .

This extract makes it clear that the meaning which Mr Hawton and Mr Coates ascribe to the word "Humanism" is only a part of its total meaning. It follows that they may only use a part of its history in their support.

There is plenty of evidence from different periods to show that some of those who called themselves humanists would have been shocked to suppose that they were thereby offering an "alternative to Christianity". Erasmus, for example, deeply criticized the Roman Church (which he himself never left), but it is to be questioned whether he would have been any more thoroughly at home in the context of the Ethical Union. Of English scholars, Sir Herbert Grierson has written:[1]

> The English Humanists, the revivers of classical studies in this country, were all men of ardent religious feeling—Linacre, Grocyn, Latimer and others. "English Humanism," says a recent German writer, "was closely akin to Puritanism, the first stage of the Puritan revolution." Colet returned from Italy not to found a Platonic Academy, but to lecture on the epistles of St Paul. When English Literature, after a period of tentative and unequal flights, revived in full force in the last twenty years of the sixteenth century, Protestantism hardening, if one may so speak, into Puritanism was rapidly becoming the dominant force in English life.

These were days when the young King Henry VIII could be a theologian, and, in being so, help to fulfil the Renaissance ideal of a complete man, such as we also discern in Leonardo da Vinci and Castiglione's Courtier.

From the eighteenth century, Johnson's Dictionary has only this interpretation of the word "humanist": "A philologer, a grammarian: a term used in the schools of Scotland." By the last part of his note, Dr Johnson means, I am sure, no disrespect to the users of this word.

The mid-eighteenth century also had its weekly paper entitled the

[1] *Cross-Currents in English Literature of the Seventeenth Century*, page 23.

Humanist. Published in London in 1757, it is in striking contrast to the paper of the same name, published in 1917, as the "organ of the Ethical Movement", or to the current periodical, *The Humanist.* The eighteenth-century writer says, in his opening article:

> . . . the title HUMANIST seems to me much more agreeable to the nature and reason of a paper, calculated to recommend everything that is amiable and beneficent in human nature, than any which writings of that kind have hitherto taken up. . . . The title of HUMANIST is clear of all these objections; and implies neither more nor less than that it interests itself in all the concerns of human nature: at least a paper undertaken upon that view is sufficiently justified in assuming that title.

Above these lines stands the great motto from Terence, which all humanists would wish to claim for their own: "Homo sum; humani a me nil alienum puto." Humanists down the ages have sought to put that ideal into effect in response to changing circumstances and changing needs. The writer of this paper interprets his task by including many subjects of Christian interest, from pew-rents to Providence. And, in Number XI, he begins bravely with a line from Lactantius, which he translates, "That no religion be taken up without wisdom, nor any wisdom approved of without religion". The papers which follow contain a defence of the proposition that Socrates was divinely inspired. The details of his argument do not concern us here, except to notice that he is opposed to those whom he calls "the idolaters of reason", and to the idea of "the infallibility of the free-thinkers' only guide". He goes on to criticize a biographer of Socrates who,

> considereth this great genius of the heathen world, only as a theist of great penetration: and the voice of his demon, as only the voice of reason. And I am no way surprised he should; since it is evident that he, in effect, deifies the human reason; and expressly calls it blasphemy against God to depreciate it. And, indeed, this is as much blasphemy against God as it would be an abuse of Tompion to say that a watch which he made, and put into the hands of a man who let it get a great fall, never went as well after that fall as it did before, but was ever after subject to great irregularities.

Mr Coates offers us the terms "humanist" and "rationalist" as, in our own day, virtually synonymous. This eighteenth-century writer, whose words we have just been reading, would not have accepted such an equation. He certainly was not a rationalist, in the modern sense. Nor was he, perhaps, a humanist, in Mr Coates's sense of that word.

In Chicago, in 1927, there was published a volume of *Humanist Sermons,* edited by Curtis B. Reese. In his Preface, the editor says,[1] "Within the liberal churches of America there is a religious movement which has come to be known as Humanism. . . . The present volume is a collection of sermons which have been used in the regular course of parish preaching." Mr Hawton said, as we saw earlier,

[1] *Humanist Sermons,* page v.

"Humanism is the outcome of a rejection of the belief in supernatural revelation". In contrast, Mr Reese says,[1] "Humanism is not Atheism . . . as a matter of fact, the Humanist attitude towards the idea of God is *not that of denial* at all; it is that of *inquiry*".

Of the last two statements, Mr Reese's, rather than Mr Hawton's, would seem to be in line with the history of Humanism as we have seen it. A similar view is expressed in this extract from a sermon by John Haynes Holmes, in the same collection: the author is speaking of the 1920s.[2]

> Already in New York City we have a vast metropolis in which the majority of the inhabitants know and care no more about religion than they do about an illuminated manuscript of the Middle Ages. What is happening to religion? Religion, as we have known it, is disintegrating, steadily and surely, under the impact of modern life. A widely read, an impressive book of our time, is significantly entitled *The Non-Religion of the Future*.
>
> All this seems clear. Yet does it seem equally clear that we cannot leave the matter here. We have the truth, but have we the whole truth? When that author writes of "the non-religion of the future", is he thinking of a vacuum to take the place of this very real substance of spiritual faith? On the contrary, does not nature abhor a vacuum in the inner life of man as well as in the outer life of the universe; and must not something, therefore, rush in, like air into an empty bottle, to take the place of what has gone? Is there not something, indeed, already rushing in? Or, to change the figure, is there not something still abiding after so much is taken away? Beatrice Webb tells us of the havoc that science wrought with her Christian faith; but she confesses her belief that it is "by prayer, by communion with an all-pervading spiritual force, that the soul of man discovers the purpose of human endeavour". Our religion is going—no doubt of that! But is it not going in order that religion itself, in some perfect and absolute sense of the word, may truly come?

These words from a Humanist sermon remind us again of the religious strain so often present in the Humanist tradition. There is also (historically, at least) a Humanist element in religion. The problem of our day is to find the right relationship between the two. The words of John Haynes Holmes remind us that when Humanists speak to-day, in so many words, of "the non-religion of the future"—as some would seem to do—we have the right to pose them a question. We may ask whether the form of Humanism they would present to us is historically the most proven, the happiest and the best. Christian writers might also feel able to give up the automatic assumption, if they have made it, that a Humanist is a rationalist, or an agnostic. In Christian circles, there is danger that the great word "Humanist" might degenerate into becoming a more or less pejorative adjective, with much emotion and little clear thought behind the use of it. It is worth a great effort now to rescue an illustrious word from such a possible fate.

Perhaps one of the surest ways of achieving this end would be if Christians and Humanists could undertake together projects in which they could share a common frontier. One such concerns the relation-

[1] *Humanist Sermons*, page vii.

[2] Ibid., page 13.

ship between morals and religion. "Does my belief, or non-belief, in God influence what I do in this world?"

Contemporary humanist thinkers have made two contributions in this field which are of great interest to Christian students of ethics. The first is to draw attention to the point in the development of a religion at which, it is alleged, the relation between that religion and morality becomes more clearly defined. On page 138 of *Religion Without Revelation,* Sir Julian Huxley describes this change.

> At this level, there is still very little unity apparent in thought, religious or other. . . . In particular, the relation of religion and its gods to morality is at this stage almost always very feebly defined.
>
> At the next level, general ideas have begun to make morality reasoned and to link this reasoned morality firmly with religion.

A valuable point of comparison is provided by a writer not, at this moment, writing specifically as a Humanist. In his *Short History of Religions,* Mr E. E. Kellett says,

> Unfortunately, in almost all nations, till comparatively recent times, that which all are agreed to call religion had little or nothing to do with morality: and often the first step in the construction of ethical systems was to denounce the current religion as at best non-moral. The great teachers, for example, alike in Palestine and in Greece, those men whose doctrines form the basis of modern "religion", are conspicuous for the vigour with which they have combated the religion of their times.[1]

In the voicing of this view, we see a way in which the spiritual tradition within Humanism may be applied to this great question.

At the same time, however, a number of Humanist writers and speakers are going into action on what seems to be a second, and different, front. They are not primarily suggesting that, for example, the Christian Church is uninterested in morality. Indeed, they sometimes say that Christian morality is too deeply embedded in the public mind! What they are saying is that morality does not depend upon Divine sanction. The title of Mrs Knight's broadcasts, "Morals Without Religion", is the outstanding phrase in point. Mr Hawton, on page 1 of his pamphlet, writes,

> . . . there is no ready-made answer-book which we can consult about the conduct of our lives or our future destiny. There is no moral law in the sense that there is a law of gravity which can be discovered by reason and experiment and about which there can be no dispute.
>
> If there is a God, we know nothing about his intentions; and so, whether we believe or disbelieve in God, it can make no difference to our behaviour. We have to make do with such natural means as we possess. There is no mystical inner light that can dispel our ignorance, no sacred writings, no infallible Church.

Describing the present situation, Mr Coates writes, on page 63,

> The view still widely prevails that traditional moral beliefs and standards have been divinely revealed, that in such matters one must rely on God and not on reason.

[1] Op. cit., page 9.

Here is a field in which Christians and Humanists can discuss and act together, and both may benefit. For, whatever we believe, we must all act, and sometimes make difficult decisions. How strong, for example, is the argument for monogamous marriage? What is a man's duty to the State? In questions such as these, Christians and Humanists alike need to go to the very depths of their beliefs about the nature of Man, if they are to find an answer. The question of incest provides a challenging, if extreme, illustration. Is the forbidding of incest a mere prohibition, or is it at the very foundation of Man's humanity? Of this, Mr Coates writes,

> What seems clear is that the incest rules were not in fact adopted in primitive societies on biological grounds, that it is in fact only in advanced societies that such considerations are ever advanced. The laws against incest, and the shuddering horror with which incestuous unions are often regarded, are superstitious in origin (p. 190).

In contrast to this view, on page 129 of *Nature into History*, Mr Leslie Paul has written,

> The discovery of incest is man's first great moral leap, perhaps the moral leap by which he becomes man, for through it man realizes that he is no longer as the animals, and can never become as the animals again without abandoning his treasured human condition.

Here we face a question which demands an answer. And we have to know whether it will be decided on merely biological grounds, or whether there is in Man a factor which transcends biology. The Christian has to face such a question, and find an answer in the light of his faith. So does the Humanist who, like the Christian, seeks to reach an understanding of Man.

> Know then thyself, presume not God to scan,
> The proper study of mankind is man.

But Pope was not infallible. And the student of Man need not suppose, at the outset, that he will find no trace of the Divine image in the being God has made. The purpose of this article has been to open the question whether it is enough to define Humanism, at the outset, as "the outcome of a rejection of the belief in supernatural revelation". Such a definition seems, to the present writer, to do justice neither to the larger history of Humanism nor to the great questions of to-day.

R. C. C. Watson.

Henry Bathurst — a Latitudinarian Bishop of Norwich

Some years ago, for the modest sum of sixpence, I picked up an old book entitled *Memoirs of Dr Henry Bathurst, Lord Bishop of Norwich*. A note inside it states that it was once the property of Lord

Macaulay, and that the marginal comments, with which the opening pages abound, are pencilled in the great man's handwriting. Evidently he felt that the bishop's daughter, by whom the memoir is written, was sadly unequal to her task, for his criticisms are severe, especially with regard to inaccurate quotations. "The lady should have asked help for the Latin", reads the note against one of them, which is scored and corrected like a schoolboy's prose; while against another howler is the single pained exclamation: "Papa!" After this Macaulay seems to have given up in despair; but whatever its shortcomings, the book is in fact of real interest because of the delightfully naive manner in which it is written, and because Bathurst must have been one of the last of the genuinely Whig prelates and one of the last members of the old latitudinarian school —as distinct from that of the broad churchmen which succeeded it.

Born in 1744, Bathurst died as Bishop of Norwich in 1837, a few months before his ninety-third birthday. He could hardly be described as a model bishop by present-day standards, but nevertheless the biography reveals him as a genial and endearing figure. Though not lacking in formal scholarship, he was, in fact, primarily a simple-hearted country gentleman who liked nothing better than a rubber of whist in the evening and who celebrated his eightieth birthday by shooting a fine cock pheasant. His episcopal preferment was due to family connexions and influence with the younger Pitt, as the memoir states with quite admirable frankness. At least we are thus left in no doubt as to why Bathurst was made a bishop—which is certainly more than can be said of all who receive similarly high preferment nowadays.

Whether the clergy and people of East Anglia suffered any great harm from the limitations and easy-going nature of their bishop is perhaps doubtful. And one incident in particular shows how Bathurst could be a wise and tolerant father in God when the occasion required it. It so happened that a child of Methodist parents in the village of Middleton, near King's Lynn, had died, and the vicar of the parish, Dean Wood, refused to allow burial in the churchyard on the ground that the child, having been baptized by a Methodist minister, was in fact unbaptized. As a last resort the Methodist superintendent appealed to the bishop, who replied as follows:

> Sir,
>
> "Days (says Job) should speak, and multitudes of years should teach wisdom." How far Dean Wood may accede to the truth of this remark as applicable in me, I dare not venture peremptorily to decide, but I am inclined to believe from the intercourse that has passed between us upon former occasions, he will not be indisposed to pay some deference to the opinion of a brother clergyman who is now in the eighty-second year of his age; and I have no hesitation in stating unequivocally what that opinion is. The decision of so well informed a civilian as Sir John Nicholl [a legal judgement in a similar case which the Dean had refused to take note of] justifies, I think, any minister of the Established Church in pursuing that line of conduct towards Dissenters of all denominations which candour and meekness, and moderation, and Christian charity, must make him pursue on all occasions, especially on so interesting a one as that mentioned in your letter, and in behalf of an individual belonging to a sect remarkably

peaceful, pious and inoffensive. Be so good as to show the Dean what I have written; he may perhaps be induced to respect my suggestions.

This tactful answer had the desired effect and the dean allowed the burial to take place in his churchyard without further trouble.

Liberal in all things, Bathurst repeatedly asserted himself on behalf of Catholic Emancipation, and he was one of the few prelates who voted in the Lords in favour of the Reform Bill. But his generous habits caused frequent annoyance among his brother bishops. For example, he persisted in ordaining men who had no title for ordination, and even a protest from the Archbishop of Canterbury failed either to ruffle his temper or reform his ways. (What, one wonders, would have been his reaction to the present mania for a new Canon Law?) Sometimes his laxity had interesting results, for one of those who owed much to the complacent Bishop of Norwich was Charles Richard Sumner. Having been refused orders at the hands of more than one other bishop, he found no difficulty in obtaining them from Bathurst. It is satisfactory to note that when Sumner himself became Bishop of Winchester he did not forget to make due acknowledgement to his former benefactor.

Bathurst was already getting on for ninety years of age when he voted for the Reform Bill; but he continued to take a keen interest in affairs of the moment almost to the end. Within a year of his death he wrote to congratulate Dr Hampden on his inaugural lecture as Regius Professor of Divinity at Oxford, as follows:

Dear Sir,

If bigotry had either ear or eye, your publication cannot fail to have the laudable effect which you have in view; but I have resided too many years in the University of Oxford to give the majority of its learned members credit for liberal opinions.

But by this time any effective oversight of his diocese had become beyond him. However, no one expected a bishop to be unduly energetic in those days. The time was still far off when Tait was to define a bishop as a man who lived in a perpetual state of chronic perspiration. In fact, when Bathurst was in his eighty-eighth year the Prime Minister, Earl Grey, pressed him to accept the Archbishopric of Dublin! Even before this he had been receiving help from other bishops in carrying out his routine duties. Thus, in 1827 he wrote:

The business of Ordination, Visitations, and Confirmations is over; and I have suffered less from fatigue than could reasonably be expected at my age. But had it not been for the kind assistance of the Bishop of Chichester, I must assuredly (to use a Newmarket phrase) have broke down in the middle of the race.

It shows a world of difference between those days and our own that a few years later, in 1833, the Bishop of Lincoln, John Kaye, could write to Bathurst this letter:

My Dear Lord,

I shall have great pleasure in rendering you any assistance, professional

> or other, in my power. The present is my idle year: I have neither visitation nor confirmation; and can, therefore, without the slightest inconvenience, hold confirmations for you at Lynn and Norwich. . . .

The present is *my idle year*—what a perfectly shocking confession for a bishop to make! Yet Kaye was not, like Bathurst himself, one of the old school. On the contrary, as the *Lincoln Diocesan Calendar* annually informs its readers:

> In the year 1827 Bishop Kaye came to Lincoln and the religious life of the diocese was thenceforth, for the remainder of the century, marked by a high standard of zeal, efficiency and devotion.

And yet Kaye could find time, on his own admission, for a whole idle year all the same!

Has there not, one wonders, been loss as well as gain in the passage from those spacious—if somewhat casual—times to the streamlined businesslike methods we deem so essential to-day? The spectacle of Bishop Bathurst, happily engaged in a game of whist or shooting down a pheasant, rather than burdened with the cares of office, is undoubtedly most inappropriate; yet, for all that, I cannot help feeling nostalgically attracted by this generous-hearted latitudinarian prelate of an age so far removed from our own.

D. L. Scott.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. J. S. Bezzant is Fellow and Dean of St John's College, Cambridge.

The Rev. R. C. C. Watson is Chaplain of Wadham College, Oxford.

The Rev. D. L. Scott is Rector of Rippingale, Lincolnshire.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE CASE OF ASSISTANT CURATES

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

May I ask for space to comment on points made by your readers on my article on assistant curates?

Mr Little raises matters of real importance. For seven years I have tried to guide and help the assistant curates in my episcopal area, for I have always in mind how many are the problems and the opportunities of taking a false step in the opening years on the Ministry. I cannot say what success attends my efforts, but this will show that we are not ignorant of this need.

Mr Wilson asks questions which I will try to answer. I am entirely

in agreement with him about the marriage of our younger men, but we cannot ignore facts. I wish they would be ready to wait for a few years, but I am sure that we have to recognize that to deprecate early marriages does not solve the consequent financial problems.

Doubtless a few buy a car which they cannot afford, but in fairness I must say that I know of no such extravagance. One or two own cars, but I happen to know that either they have private means and are therefore outside the scope of what I wrote, or they have been given a car by a wealthy relative. We must not forget that a car helps the family man on holidays.

That there should be a countrywide scale of allowances is both desirable and necessary. But in my view it must come first in the diocese.

I am sorry that the stipend paid to suffragan bishops has been brought in. I do not want to obscure the original subject, but I would make two remarks. Out of our stipend we have to pay enormous expenses of office. Then what is called "a generous house allowance" in fact is inadequate in most instances and, in my own case, just covers the rent and rates on this modest house in Clapham.

Yours faithfully,
WILLIAM KINGSTON.

89 NORTH SIDE,
CLAPHAM COMMON,
S.W.4.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I feel bound to make a rejoinder to your correspondent, the Rev. Spencer W. Wilson. Two points arise. (1) It is true that the potentially married deacon *becomes aware* in the months before Ordination of the figure that his stipend will be, but unless he is already married (and I was not) he has no idea of the expenses involved in clerical married life which the figure of £375 to £400 a year will have to meet. Especially is this so if his background is working class, for whom that figure is "a reasonable start". (2) The business of "falling in love", and so getting married, once conceded as a possibility in the future, cannot be regulated by anybody. Ordained say in 1958, one does not "decide to fall in love in 1960". It happens or it doesn't in 1958, 1959, or 1960. Neither is the solution of a long engagement ever a satisfactory one. Surely any married man would accept the validity of these points?

I would add, in conclusion, that my present rector (himself a bachelor) in conversation on this matter remarked that he had found there was much to be said for married curates. In these days it was increasingly difficult to provide suitable lodgings for a single man, and, being concerned with the welfare of his curates, he slept the happier in the knowledge that they were adequately housed and regularly fed and looked after.

The real problem, I suggest, is to make the Church decide if it

wants married clergy or not, and if it does, to make adequate provision for them within the system from the very start.

Yours faithfully,
FRANK E. PICKARD.

THE FARM OF THE GOOD SHEPHERD,
LEFTWICH, CHESHIRE.

UNIVERSITY ANGLICAN SOCIETIES

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

It has been the experience of myself and of many other members of University Anglican Societies that they fail considerably to function as means of encouraging "comprehensiveness" and maturity in Christian belief. Alarming though it might seem, it is a fact that such societies invariably are cliques and fail to hold the interest and support of many sincere Anglicans.

Mr Cripps might have mentioned how that S.C.M. does in fact fulfil most of the functions of a satisfactory Anglican Society. It often succeeds in teaching young men and women to read their Bibles, to pray, and to think seriously about their belief. And frequently enables a student to use his or her Anglican background of worship and sacraments within a larger and more realistic context. That this is done within an inter-denominational society would surely seem more sound and to offer greater opportunities.

As S.C.M. continues to draw Anglicans into the "whole" Church and stimulates them to value their own traditions, it would seem no great pity that societies which usually are so unhealthy (and often are known as such by non-Christian students) should have to give place.

Yours faithfully,
GERALD GREENWOOD.

GLEBE HOUSE,
MOORGATE,
ROTHERHAM.

"AD EPISCOPUM"

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Of the two letters published in your August–September issue referring to my sermon of May 1, I am precluded from answering one by its discourtesy. But to Mr Feilden I would say that the clergy, like the judiciary, should be irremovable *Quam diu se bene gesserint;* and for the same reason, that otherwise they must lack the independence necessary for a proper discharge of their functions.

Yours faithfully,
F. A. SIMPSON.

TRINITY COLLEGE,
CAMBRIDGE.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

"Any publick reader in either of Our Universities" (His Majesty's Declaration, prefixed to the Articles of Religion); "I believe the Doctrine of the Church of England as therein set forth to be agreeable to the Word of God" (Declaration of Assent). Poor Mr Penn! The situation is much more serious than he seems to realize—and he is condemned out of his own mouth.

Yours, etc.,
H. J. M. TURNER.

THE GOOD SHEPHERD VICARAGE,
ROCHDALE.

ELDERS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I wonder how many of us in the Church of England realize quite how deep a depression has settled over the ecumenically minded members of the Church of Scotland, now that the dust has settled on the "Bishops' Report". This was the impression that I received meeting friends while holidaying there. They are distressed at the way in which the Jenny Geddes campaign of the *Scottish Daily Express* carried all before it. But they feel at least as strongly that the support that they received from over the border was negligible. All were frustrated by the feeling that, while in Scotland discussion groups were being held in the smallest parishes, the Church of England as a whole was just sitting back waiting for Scotland to fall into its lap. Where, they say, was the comparable interest in England? Is there anything to show that we took their part of the proposals as seriously as they did ours? Their own people may have been intransigent, but they felt that the Anglican attitude to be a deadly combination of indifference and intransigence, the former deep embedded in our church life, the latter officially underlined by Lambeth 1958, whose report left many feeling that three sides of the quadrilateral were being erased, while the fourth was being dug deep into an impenetrable barrier.

Before the Joint Report is cast aside surely we must consider its proposal that the Church of England should accept lay elders into its system. At this stage any action which we took in this direction would be bound to be a unilateral action, but this would naturally have a much greater effect in Scotland than if we insisted on waiting for them to swallow the—through Scottish eyes—much bigger pill, before we reluctantly take the little one. It would be just the sort of gesture needed to restore confidence and to leave the way open for future discussions. I do not believe that using a Presbyterian model would impair future progress with denominations of a more congregational tradition. It is obviously more suited to incorporation with episcopacy, and it would, in Free Church eyes, fulfil the same ends.

But, quite apart from any ecumenical purpose, is this not our own most desperate need? To quote the Bishop of Sheffield's current letter, ". . . the fact is the absence of a sufficient number of intelligent, believing lay men and women prepared to give time and trouble to share in the total ministry in very many parishes". This will not be solved by the creation of elders, but it would provide a framework within which it could develop. The Church of Scotland is only now discovering the richness of its own tradition in the sharing of "the total ministry". Is it inevitable that we shall say that if they won't play in our garden, neither will we play in theirs?

Yours truly,
C. M. Ballard.

The Clergy House,
St George Gate,
Doncaster.

BOOK REVIEWS

Eighteenth Century Church and People. By S. C. Carpenter. John Murray. 35s.

With this book Dr Carpenter completed his trilogy on English Church History. *The Church in England, 597–1688* appeared in 1954, and *Church and People, 1789–1899,* first published twenty-six years ago, has made a welcome reappearance as a three-volume paperback. Although Dr Carpenter's new book is unlikely to secure the firm position with scholars and theological students that his nineteenth-century volume has achieved, it is very much to be commended. Like all his books, this one is extremely readable, apart from the occasional long-winded sentence that demands a second attempt. He draws extensively from contemporary literature and admirably conveys the atmosphere of a period in which, on his own confession, he does not feel at home. Many of his pen-portraits are admirable. I enjoyed especially those of Burnet, Warburton and Dr Johnson. I was disappointed in not being allowed to make the further acquaintance of Simon Patrick, who on his appointment to the bishopric of Chichester in 1689 wrote in his diary: "I fell into a meditation of the goodness of God, who had brought me into the world, and let me live sixty-three years in much wealth, ease and pleasure . . . and made me a minister of the Gospel, and placed me in an advantageous position."

In the earlier part of the book the author deals chiefly with developments in Church and State, he then passes on to theological controversy, the parishes, revival movements, church policy and concludes with an entertaining final chapter on "Some Eccentrics". The chapters on theological controversy are helpful and illuminating, but that entitled "The New Divinity" is a little disappointing. More is required to show why reason was in favour and "enthusiasm" at a discount. If the author had made some use of G. R. Cragg's *From*

Puritanism to the Age of Reason he would have strengthened this section.

The chapter on John Wesley is charitable and fair-minded. Dr Carpenter is surely right to insist "that Methodism, as it was, could not have found a permanent home within the Church of England" (p. 210). Wesley had erected a machine with an Anglican façade but which was in its essence very different. Wesley's emphasis on the parity of ministers needs more emphasis than Dr Carpenter gives. Nothing is said of the translation by John Wesley of some of the classics into basic English to teach his followers to read. *Author of Life Divine* is wrongly attributed to Charles Wesley; John was the author (p. 213). The following chapter on the Evangelicals is also sympathetic, but Dr Carpenter tends to see the early Evangelicals through the spectacles of their mid-Victorian grandchildren. It is doubtful whether any of the significant leaders "attached to the whole Bible an almost uniform importance" (p. 224), nor did they all "abjure dancing" (p. 221); Henry Venn, for instance, employed a dancing master to instruct his children. The significance of John Newton is missed. The leader of the London Evangelicals and founder of the Eclectic Society has an importance equal to that of Walker and Venn. It was Isaac, not Joseph, Milner who was Wilberforce's friend (p. 225) and the Simeon and Thornton Trustees are not to be identified (p. 229).

In the chapter on Church Policy, and in many other places, the former Dean of Exeter has borrowed widely and wisely from the writings of the present Dean of Winchester. If Dr Carpenter's book leads the general reader on to the more authoritative works of Dr Sykes it will have served a good purpose and given the reader much enjoyment on the way.

Michael Hennell.

St Aidan's College,
Birkenhead.

Philosophy of Religion. By D. Elton Trueblood. Rockliff. 35s.

This work by the Professor of Philosophy in Earlham College is narrower in its scope than its title properly indicates, for it does little more than present a reasoned and on the whole familiar case for what the author calls "the theistic hypothesis". Most of the main arguments that have been formulated by thinkers in support of theism and in answer to objections to it are carefully expounded as constituting a "cumulative" case weightier than any one of the arguments taken in isolation. There is little that is new in the presentation, but it has the freshness of clear, competent and interesting writing informed by wide reading and occasionally rising to a trenchant and challenging vigour. The author obviously owes a considerable debt, as he himself acknowledges, to William Temple, whom he describes, surely too enthusiastically, as "the most distinguished theologian of our century". The book should provide, as it appears intended to do, a useful introduction to "philosophical

theology" and a basis for the classroom teaching of students who need and desire a reflective underpinning of their belief in God, but who come to the subject without any specialized training in philosophy and without equipment or opportunity, or even perhaps inclination, to explore more deeply and thoroughly the issues raised.

It is to be feared, however, that Prof. Trueblood's exposition will leave more sceptical and philosophically trained minds unpersuaded and dissatisfied, particularly if they have no such prior interest in and disposition towards theistic religion and belief, as Prof. Trueblood, writing in the midst of the astonishing "religiousness" of the American people, perhaps too easily assumes in his readers. To such as these the argument may well seem at times to move somewhat too easily and confidently to the desired theistic conclusion—jumping some logical gaps (as, e.g., in the transition from the successes of science in exploring nature to a supernatural Mind as the ground of nature), leaving the precise meaning of important categories insufficiently explored and defined (as, e.g., in the classification of "faith" in God with "faith" as operative in the pursuit of knowledge), failing to face other possible alternative explanations or reasons for an agnostic suspense of judgment (as, e.g., in the dubious argument to theism from the second law of thermo-dynamics). Also, any who are versed in the work of contemporary philosophers and philosophical theologians in this country the book will give the impression of being at some points out of date, a voice from the twenties and thirties rather than from the mid-century. An illustration of this is the fact that Prof. Trueblood devotes a lengthy chapter to the now *passé* challenge of Logical Positivism, discussing in particular the proposition, which few to-day would wish to defend, that statements are meaningless nonsense if not verifiable, at least in principle, in sensory experience. The much more important and subtle issues which are being raised by linguistic philosophy in relation to the meaning and logic of religious language and of statements which contain "God" as their subject, are not mentioned—the difficult issue, for example, of the "non-falsifiability" of such a statement as "God is Love". Wisdom's famous essay on "Gods" is indeed referred to, but it is dismissed in a single sentence in a way that seems to indicate a failure to grasp its essential point. A comparison of Prof. Trueblood's discussion with, say, that of Prof. Hick in his *Faith and Knowledge* (published at the same time) would illustrate and emphasize the point. But perhaps all this only bears witness to the time-lag that there so often is between American and British thought.

H. H. Farmer.

Peterhouse,
Cambridge.

Foundations of the Responsible Society. By Walter G. Muelder. Abingdon Press, U.S.A. $6.

Dr Muelder is Dean and Professor of Social Ethics of the Boston University School of Theology. He has played a considerable part in

the various study projects of the World Council of Churches in recent years. In this book he develops the theme of "the responsible society", a phrase coined first in the ecumenical thinking prior to the Amsterdam Assembly of the World Council of Churches, taken up at that Assembly and again at the Evanston Assembly, and constituting the framework of the current social research projects of the World Council of Churches. Dr Muelder's first chapter is an analysis of the background and context of "the idea of a responsible society". Originally given as a separate lecture it states the basic theme, the rest of the book being an illustrative expansion against an American background. There is one chapter on the family, two on law and the political order, seven on the economic order and a final one on the international order. Some British and continental thinkers are quoted, and the problems raised are common to Western industrial civilization anywhere, but the strength of the book lies in dealing with them in the particular setting of one country. It is unlikely, therefore, that there will be a British edition, though we in Britain must be grateful for what is to some extent a pioneering book in a field where far too little is done in this country.

Dr Muelder is well aware of the necessity of the writer on Christian ethics steeping himself in the empirical data of the problems he is discussing. This is a heavy task because of the amount and complexity of the material even in the one order of economic, social and industrial life where the main emphasis of the book lies. The difficulty is to see the wood for the trees. The author, however, has involved himself in further difficulties by trying to write a student's text-book. (One is envious that there are enough students of Christian ethics in the U.S.A. to make this a publishing proposition.) The result is a book which has few graces of style, much jargon, and is so dull as to be almost unreadable. As a source of information, however, it is excellent if wisely used. It is the kind of textbook that only the best students can be trusted with. It is full of paragraphs summarizing other books (of very varying importance) and of numerical summaries such as students taking down notes from a lecture might make for themselves. Sometimes a continuous text is obtained by linking authors whose point of view is very different. Vast themes follow one another in successive paragraphs. To take examples at random, the five functions of an economic order take two pages, the ten points of a Christian critique of communism take one and a half; in the chapter on the state, one paragraph on Hegel and Marx is succeeded by a page and a half on the Roman Catholic theory of the state, and then by one paragraph which deals with no less than the *laisser-faire* view, J. S. Mill's modification of it and the views of T. H. Green. At this level of compression it will be seen what a large amount of material is covered in this substantial book and why I stress both its value as a source book and its danger to the average student.

It is inevitable that particular chapters are not as good as special studies covering one particular field; for instance, that on responsible management is outshone by C. H. Northcott's recent study of the same theme in this country. The chapter on responsible consumption

is also thin, but here there is less good material to work on. It is valuable, though, to have these various issues raised and empirically dealt with under one cover. One is left grateful for a source book and hoping that Dr Muelder will get his head above his sources and give us more of his own evaluations.

Ronald Preston.

University of Manchester.

New Testament Essays. Studies in memory of Thomas Walter Manson, 1893–1958, sponsored by pupils, colleagues, and friends. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester University Press. 1959. 42s.

This book which was intended by the University of Manchester as a Festschrift for Dr Manson's sixty-fifth birthday becomes now a memorial volume. It contains a curriculum vitae and photograph, a select bibliography of his works, and a list of subscribers. The essays include three in French and two in German. All are instructive and some are of outstanding interest. This is a fitting tribute to a fine scholar and will further the studies to which he made a distinguished contribution.

Four contributors deal with the origins of the synoptic gospels. Prof. J. W. Bowman, by studying the Syriac terms for "gospel", shows the importance of Christian Palestinian Aramaic as a middle term between the Old Testament in Hebrew and the Gospels in Greek. Prof. C. F. D. Moule considers that it was the intention of the evangelists to produce apologetic rather than liturgical writings, and thinks that, while Luke and John were tracts for outsiders, Matthew and Mark were instructions for Christian apologists. Dr H. G. Wood argues against too sharp a separation of *didache* and *kerygma*, and believes that the sayings of Jesus were successful apologetic and were included in the gospel from the first. Prof. C. H. Dodd assumes the general soundness of Carrington and Selwyn's suggestions about a Primitive Catechism, and finds traces of such a catechism in the Gospels, especially among the eschatological sayings. He concludes that catechetical instruction, based on earlier Jewish and Hellenistic models though moulded by distinct Christian motives, provided a convenient framework in teaching for the remembered sayings of Jesus. Yet it was not the main channel of the tradition, and catechetical motives had only a limited influence on the Gospels.

Dr V. Taylor discusses the original order of Q by demonstrating that sayings in the Matthean discourses and elsewhere seem often to have been taken in sequences from the Q source (in Luke's order). Sayings which break the sequences can often be explained by Matthew's editorial work or preference for the M version. This elaborate study can be challenged in details, but shows that the early tradition contained sayings in written or remembered sequences. Yet it is possible and even likely that the Q material may have been more complex than a single document.

The editor of the volume surveys work on "Son of Man" since Dr

Manson's famous study in 1931, and can point to little general agreement. Prof. C. K. Barrett examines the language of Mark 10. 45 and finds it difficult to accept the claim that it points to Isa. 53, and discovers its background of thought, not in the Servant sayings, but in the martyrdom theme of late Judaism. Prof. M. Black makes proposals for solving the chronological problem of the arrest and trial of Jesus by drawing attention to the compression of the Markan account. Prof. O. Cullmann reinforces his view about the original setting of Matt. 16. 16–19 at the Last Supper and suggests why Matthew transposed it. Prof. J. Jeremias examines the sending out of disciples two by two; and Prof. H. H. Rowley vigorously criticizes the supposed links between John Baptist and the Qumran sect.

Prof. E. Schweizer gives a very stimulating account of the concept of the Church in the Gospel and Epistles of St John, especially emphasizing its distinction from the Pauline teaching. Prof. R. Bultmann describes and approves the general approach of Haenschen's commentary on Acts but criticizes, with illuminating examples, his tendency to play down written sources.

There are two Pauline word studies: on ἔκτρωμα in 1 Cor. 15. 8 by Prof. J. Munck; and on ἱστορῆσαι Κηφᾶν in Gal. 1. 18 by Prof. G. D. Kilpatrick. The late Dr W. Manson analysed the argument of Rom. 1–8. Prof. H. Clavier suggests that in Hebrews ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ may have a deeper meaning than is ordinarily supposed; and Dr G. H. Boobyer discusses the indebtedness of the Second Epistle of Peter to the First and, beyond that, to synoptic tradition.

Three general New Testament studies deal with liturgical matters. Prof. B. Reicke surveys worship in the New Testament; Prof. H. Riesenfeld offers an answer to the question why Christians changed from Sabbath to the Lord's Day; and Prof. W. C. van Unnik examines at length the biblical and liturgical origin of the dialogue *Dominus vobiscum; Et cum spiritu tuo.*

These essays will be a rich and varied source of information for New Testament students and they will wish that the book possessed an index.

K. Grayston.

Bristol.

Christianity and the Atom. By Hugh K. Trevaskis. P. R. Macmillan. 15s.

This book traces the early history of religion and science, surveys the nineteenth-century clash between them, and then attempts to show that there is no necessity for the conflict. The author describes it as an answer to the heart-cry of Katherine Mansfield: "I wish I could believe in God; I can't. Science seems to make it impossible."

The author has a very concise style, reminiscent of notes for a series of lectures, and he contrives to cover a vast amount of ground. In the process, he reveals the vast extent of his reading and the careful way he has thought out many of the problems, and yet one never feels that he is "showing off" in the objectionable way so

is also thin, but here there is less good material to work on. It is valuable, though, to have these various issues raised and empirically dealt with under one cover. One is left grateful for a source book and hoping that Dr Muelder will get his head above his sources and give us more of his own evaluations.

Ronald Preston.

University of Manchester.

New Testament Essays. Studies in memory of Thomas Walter Manson, 1893–1958, sponsored by pupils, colleagues, and friends. Edited by A. J. B. Higgins. Manchester University Press. 1959. 42s.

This book which was intended by the University of Manchester as a Festschrift for Dr Manson's sixty-fifth birthday becomes now a memorial volume. It contains a curriculum vitae and photograph, a select bibliography of his works, and a list of subscribers. The essays include three in French and two in German. All are instructive and some are of outstanding interest. This is a fitting tribute to a fine scholar and will further the studies to which he made a distinguished contribution.

Four contributors deal with the origins of the synoptic gospels. Prof. J. W. Bowman, by studying the Syriac terms for "gospel", shows the importance of Christian Palestinian Aramaic as a middle term between the Old Testament in Hebrew and the Gospels in Greek. Prof. C. F. D. Moule considers that it was the intention of the evangelists to produce apologetic rather than liturgical writings, and thinks that, while Luke and John were tracts for outsiders, Matthew and Mark were instructions for Christian apologists. Dr H. G. Wood argues against too sharp a separation of *didache* and *kerygma,* and believes that the sayings of Jesus were successful apologetic and were included in the gospel from the first. Prof. C. H. Dodd assumes the general soundness of Carrington and Selwyn's suggestions about a Primitive Catechism, and finds traces of such a catechism in the Gospels, especially among the eschatological sayings. He concludes that catechetical instruction, based on earlier Jewish and Hellenistic models though moulded by distinct Christian motives, provided a convenient framework in teaching for the remembered sayings of Jesus. Yet it was not the main channel of the tradition, and catechetical motives had only a limited influence on the Gospels.

Dr V. Taylor discusses the original order of Q by demonstrating that sayings in the Matthean discourses and elsewhere seem often to have been taken in sequences from the Q source (in Luke's order). Sayings which break the sequences can often be explained by Matthew's editorial work or preference for the M version. This elaborate study can be challenged in details, but shows that the early tradition contained sayings in written or remembered sequences. Yet it is possible and even likely that the Q material may have been more complex than a single document.

The editor of the volume surveys work on "Son of Man" since Dr

Manson's famous study in 1931, and can point to little general agreement. Prof. C. K. Barrett examines the language of Mark 10. 45 and finds it difficult to accept the claim that it points to Isa. 53, and discovers its background of thought, not in the Servant sayings, but in the martyrdom theme of late Judaism. Prof. M. Black makes proposals for solving the chronological problem of the arrest and trial of Jesus by drawing attention to the compression of the Markan account. Prof. O. Cullmann reinforces his view about the original setting of Matt. 16. 16–19 at the Last Supper and suggests why Matthew transposed it. Prof. J. Jeremias examines the sending out of disciples two by two; and Prof. H. H. Rowley vigorously criticizes the supposed links between John Baptist and the Qumran sect.

Prof. E. Schweizer gives a very stimulating account of the concept of the Church in the Gospel and Epistles of St John, especially emphasizing its distinction from the Pauline teaching. Prof. R. Bultmann describes and approves the general approach of Haenschen's commentary on Acts but criticizes, with illuminating examples, his tendency to play down written sources.

There are two Pauline word studies: on ἔκτρωμα in 1 Cor. 15. 8 by Prof. J. Munck; and on ἱστορῆσαι Κηφᾶν in Gal. 1. 18 by Prof. G. D. Kilpatrick. The late Dr W. Manson analysed the argument of Rom. 1–8. Prof. H. Clavier suggests that in Hebrews ὁ λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ may have a deeper meaning than is ordinarily supposed; and Dr G. H. Boobyer discusses the indebtedness of the Second Epistle of Peter to the First and, beyond that, to synoptic tradition.

Three general New Testament studies deal with liturgical matters. Prof. B. Reicke surveys worship in the New Testament; Prof. H. Riesenfeld offers an answer to the question why Christians changed from Sabbath to the Lord's Day; and Prof. W. C. van Unnik examines at length the biblical and liturgical origin of the dialogue *Dominus vobiscum; Et cum spiritu tuo.*

These essays will be a rich and varied source of information for New Testament students and they will wish that the book possessed an index.

K. Grayston.

Bristol.

Christianity and the Atom. By Hugh K. Trevaskis. P. R. Macmillan. 15s.

This book traces the early history of religion and science, surveys the nineteenth-century clash between them, and then attempts to show that there is no necessity for the conflict. The author describes it as an answer to the heart-cry of Katherine Mansfield: "I wish I could believe in God; I can't. Science seems to make it impossible."

The author has a very concise style, reminiscent of notes for a series of lectures, and he contrives to cover a vast amount of ground. In the process, he reveals the vast extent of his reading and the careful way he has thought out many of the problems, and yet one never feels that he is "showing off" in the objectionable way so

characteristic of much of modern critical writing. Such a style has its disadvantages; the reader has to accustom himself to it, some repetition is inevitable, and the many cross-references tend to make the reader lose the thread of the argument at times.

We are brought face to face with the apparent conflict between a science with almost completely deterministic laws, which seems to leave no room for the Christian doctrine that Man needs divine help and guidance in some form if he is to make anything worth while of his life. As more and more scientific laws are discovered, possible means by which God *might* be communicating with men become discredited one by one. We no longer think that thunder is the voice of Jove, nor do many people now believe that the divine will can be ascertained by casting lots. The materialist claim is that there is every reason to expect this sort of erosion of once-cherished religious beliefs to continue further as scientific knowledge advances.

By 1900, says the author, there was tacit agreement that certain subjects "led nowhere" and so were unfit for public discussion. He surveys the developments of twentieth-century science, but does not think that they have altered the fundamental dilemma in any important respect. His own solution to it is based on the philosophy of Organism, which insists that the whole of the natural world is permeated with "mind-stuff". This thesis is developed in detail and many very interesting applications of it are made. At times, the author seems to overplay his hand, for example, when he claims that atoms and electrons are alive and that the atoms that make up an unborn baby obey laws that are in some way different from those governing other atoms. He would have been on much stronger ground if he had contented himself with developing the consequences of the assertion that, say, a picture is something definitely more than the sum total of canvas and paints. In this sort of way it is possible to portray creative activity by minds, and their interrelations with one another, without meeting the dilemma mentioned above. It is not likely that the effect of a great work of art on other minds will ever be reduced to a set of equations, so why should we expect that all religious and mystical experiences can be explained away?

The author has attempted an enormous task, but one of the most worthwhile ones that faces us to-day, that of interpreting Christianity in terms of modern knowledge. The reader who perseveres with the book must be hard indeed to please if he does not find some thoughts and references that will interest and reward him. In such a context, we can gladly forgive the author for riding some hobby-horses, such as dislike of the Higher Criticism.

H. N. V. Temperley.

Grantchester.

Spiritual Problems in Contemporary Literature. Edited by Stanley Romaine Hopper. Hamish Hamilton. 12s.

Symposia are unreviewable, and the better the more so. It's like

a half postcard to describe a journey down the Amazon. These limp covers sag under eighteen weighty contributors, considering: Religion and the Artist's Situation—and the Artist's Means—and the Artist's Beliefs. (Far from watertight compartments, rather bogus subdivision.) To make things harder they are mainly unknown Americans, plus the saving grace of Denis de Rougemont. This in a Harper Torchbook series starting so familiarly: Barth, Berdyaev, Buber. . . . We do have potted biographies.

One embarks dubiously, with foreboding. Yet all stages have their fascination. At times the whirlpools of assertion are too rapid, too sweeping, swamping threatens and the scenery blurs. Vide Messrs Burke and Hopper in "Mysticism as a Solution of the Poet's Dilemma". Mr Burke plunges and lunges all round him, semantics, scholastics, psychology. I'm not surprised he lost his MS. (quaint footnote on p. 95). Like an Australian fast bowler, he's "all over the place" . . . but produces some skittling good ones.

De Rougemont, original and profound, remains lucid. He punctures inflated notions of Art, Beauty, Creation (man can only *compose*), and has withering paragraphs on the implications of our belief that the artist makes *useless* objects. Criticism must become at once more technical and more theological. A suggestive passage relates our inherited Romantic terminology ("creates", "incarnates reality", "inspires") to the Persons of the Trinity. "To meditate upon the mystery of the Father . . ." leads us to understand both what the artist does and his limitations.

Also commended: Fowlie on the French situation; Albert Salamon (and rather solemn) on the tension between sociology and literature —as "destiny" is replaced by "manipulation" Christian drama and tragedy just fade away; Theodore Spencer, for a magisterial chapter on the Drama; and David Daiches, a critic of status here in his native land, on "Theodicy, Poetry and Tradition". Contrasting the Romantics to the older and more genuinely "religious" poets, he observes that Job, Dante, Shakespeare and Milton "freed man for action", while Dover Beach or Tennyson's "Break, Break, Break" cultivate that very state from which the classical katharsis seeks to relieve. And "what was the modern poet to do, who shared the romantic poets' confusion about religion and at the same time repudiated their exploitation of personality?" But he ends with a clarion call (might be a side glance at various fellow contributors?), "We need neither new knowledge nor new faith, but rather the ability to handle what we have. . . . If the artist would spend less time alternately bewailing his 'alienation' from society and flourishing his unemployed skills, he might realize . . ."

For the statistically minded, the great name of Eliot is invoked in fourteen of the eighteen chapters, and there are misspellings on pp. 166 and 228.

D. W. Foster.

Hull.

The English Church and the Continent. Edited by C. R. Dodwell. Faith Press. 15s.

The Anglican Church in British Columbia. By Frank A. Peake. Vancouver, B.C.: Mitchell Press. N.p.

In *The English Church and the Continent* Dr C. R. Dodwell has published a remarkably distinguished series of lectures given at Lambeth Palace in 1957 which offer the general clerical reader what he needs on this branch of English Church History to correct any of the customary myths that may linger in his mind. Prof. R. R. Darlington on the Anglo-Saxon period, Dom David Knowles on the Twelfth and Thirteenth Centuries, and Dr W. A. Pantin on the Later Middle Ages, make clear the varied but thoroughgoing character of our Church's involvement in the whole Western Church. Prof. Owen Chadwick remarks that "the history of the Reformation in England is to a large extent a history of continental influence upon English minds". At the end of the sixteenth century there is something of a change. "By 1595 the defence of episcopacy had already passed from the modest doctrine that bishops were regrettable, through the middling doctrine that bishops were useful, to the affirmation that bishops were right, right by historical constitution if not right by apostolic edict." We begin to pass in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries (described by the Dean of Winchester) to the Anglicanism with which we are familiar, increasingly self-conscious and with its concern for other Churches expressed rather in diplomacy and in the relief of suffering than in a conviction of interdependence; Canon Waddams admirably summarizes the range and scope of this activity (which indeed owes a very great deal to his own work), and it is noticeable how much greater is in this last period our relationship with the Eastern Churches.

Is the logic of our history, then, that the Continent is a mother from whom when we Anglicans have come of age we must escape, merely a schoolmaster to Christ, to be left behind when we have graduated? Or is it rather that we are at our best and most fruitful when we are most dynamically a part of Europe? There is surely modern evidence to match that assembled by Dr Chadwick from bookshops and by Dr Knowles and Dr Pantin from pilgrimages. Barth and Brunner and Bonhoeffer, and to a lesser extent Dibelius and Bultmann and many another, are bought and read among Anglicans (though it is also true that a recent correspondent in the *Church Times* prays that we may be delivered from producing our own "Barth or Bultmann or any such oddity"!); and the influence of Continental Protestant theology is still strong among us—stronger perhaps than a generation ago. Equally—and here it is more a matter of pilgrimage than the direct buying of books—we are influenced by Continental Catholic ideas, particularly from France. It can indeed be argued that the two most important particular influences within the pervasive Ecumenical Movement as a whole have been from the German Confessional Church, mediated in a variety of ways (not least the life and work of Bishop George Bell, to whom this volume

is fitly dedicated), and from the Liturgical Movement—witness *Parish and People* and many books, large and small (especially the small ones that get beyond the study to the pew).

Perhaps, then, the logic of our history is that we flourish best when we clearly know ourselves to belong with the Continent in Europe, and take an active and eager share in its Christian life—by parish holiday parties to Germany and France, by individual participation in the German *Kirchentag*, by organized study, for example, of modern Continental church building (so much more adventurous than our own), by such imaginative efforts as the S.P.G.'s combination of its 1960 Summer Schools with seeing the Passion Play at Oberammergau, and at a more official level by an active share in European Churches' Conferences (important not least because they bridge the political gap between East and West).

The Anglican Church in British Columbia is a competent history of the foundation and development of what are now the five dioceses of the Province of British Columbia. The story is told mainly in terms of framework—the establishment of churches and of dioceses, with occasional sketches of outstanding personalities. There are the usual ingredients of the Anglican story in the last 100 years—a Protestant schism over "ritualism", rival theological colleges on "party" lines (these have now been united), and secessions to Rome. Disciples of Roland Allen will find grist to their mill. One of the first bishop's services was the dedication of a new church. Bishop Hills commented: "The musical part of the service was very creditably performed considering that most present had never before heard chanting." There were faith and hope, obedience and endurance, not to say heroism, at least one outstanding pioneer leader who turned sour, and one splendid eccentric saint who didn't: but the book fails to convey effectively the flavour of God's people in British Columbia.

David M. Paton.

London.

Christian Science To-day: Power, Policy, Practice. By C. S. Braden. Allen and Unwin. 30s.

Dr Braden (who describes himself as a liberal Methodist) is not primarily concerned with the original beliefs and doctrines of the Christian Science movement—and in respect of these he leans over backwards in tolerance and sympathy—but rather with the centralized bureaucracy and rigid control exercised by the Board of Directors in Boston.

All authority in the movement is concentrated in the hands of this self-perpetuating body of five persons. Dr Braden gives much information concerning the workings of this control, the pressure brought to bear on Christian Science teachers and practitioners to toe the line, and the attempts to influence publishers against writers not officially authorized. Mrs Eddy, though she claimed to regard organization as not essential to religion, set up a religious organization as tightly organized as any, and it is organization, not doctrine,

which has been the chief cause of the rebellion and dissent of many faithful and convinced Christian Scientists. Article X of the Church Manual is held to justify a ban on free discussion of Christian Science. Almost any person who has any considerable influence within the Christian Science church owes his position to the Board of Directors. Every branch officer is under the immediate jurisdiction of this Board, and may function only so long as he is a member in good standing. Every lecture has to be submitted for approval to the clerk of the Mother Church (in Boston) before delivery, and lecturers have been dismissed by the Board for deviating from their script. At an inter-faith group, a Roman Catholic student prepared his own statement of belief, but the Christian Scientist might not do so.

In regard to the development of Christian Science thought and practice, it is interesting to see what varieties there are or have been in the movement. None question the quasi-infallibility of Mrs Eddy, or substantially alter or even adapt or supplement her teaching. Such varieties of belief as there are all claim to be based on Mrs Eddy and her writings: and, in fact, the differences correspond largely to various stages in the development, or different aspects, of the thought of the Discoverer and Founder of Christian Science: for example, whether it is the mind of the patient, or that of the practitioner (healer), which must be cleared of false belief in order to cure the patient.

On a number of particular points the book provides useful information. For example, Christian Scientists object to inoculation and vaccination, and a number of States (i.e. in the U.S.A., not various countries—the book has virtually only the U.S.A. in mind) make provision for conscientious objection by Christian Scientists to such regulations. In the armed forces, however, both vaccination and inoculation are accepted as inevitable. In World War II there were Christian Scientist army chaplains: these were able to "throw wonderful protection about the groups which they served". The movement claims to report all contagious diseases: but, Dr Braden points out, its practitioners are not qualified to diagnose what is a contagious disease. Formerly, Christian Scientists were denied compensation in cases of accident, since the injuries were on a Christian Science view unreal: but compensation is now granted and accepted. Celibacy is rated more highly than marriage.

Since most books deal mainly, if not exclusively, with the origins and founder, such a book as this, chiefly concerned with the period after Mrs Eddy's death (1910), and well documented, is the more valuable and interesting, and to be welcomed. I gather that official Christian spokesmen, while they deplore the writer's sympathy for Christian Science dissenters, and feel that he errs in emphasis and interpretation, do not substantially question his facts: and no doubt it is true enough, as they say, that the vast majority of Christian Science church members do not feel their church government to be dictatorial or oppressive.

G. F. S. Gray.

Fakenham.

SHORTER NOTICES

St John Chrysostom. Pastor and Preacher. By Donald Attwater. Harvill Press. 1959. 18s.

John Chrysostom's immense popularity over the centuries is evidence of Christian common sense; for Christians recognized a man who could make sense of Scripture in terms of his own day, without the extravagant allegories of Alexandria or the reactionary literalism of a later Antioch. His method of exegesis, which should be of the greatest interest to preachers because it is independent of its age, will be most clearly seen in some of the well-translated extracts from his homilies in this biography. It would be idle and ungrateful to complain that the author does not tell us what he thinks of Chrysostom's place in the development of exegesis: that is not what he sets out to do.

This is, in fact, a book for those who wish to recapture the spirit of an age in some ways like our own, in others fantastically different. In spite of television, Chrysostom's barbarian Goth (p. 60) might have been alive to-day, who said, "Apparently the Romans have no wives and children, so they have to find amusement outside their homes" (for "Romans" read "we"). His strictures on those who call theatre-going culture, riches freedom, extravagance generosity, and who teach their children only the outward values (p. 62), speak to our situation. On the other hand, the fierce feelings called out by religious principles, the fanatical loyalty to a religious leader and preacher, the uncompromising denunciation of corrupt government, provide us with a contrast to our own age. We could do with more vehemence, not only from angry young men but from angry young congregations, in the pursuit of truth.

It does a man good to read a book like this: it does a parish priest several kinds of good; nor need he be frightened off by the *Imprimatur*—there is no Roman bias. There is no hushed-voice type of devotional moralizing, no theologian's jargon, no debunking of the central figure nor extravagant praise. John Chrysostom is seen for what he was, a lovable, tactless, whitehot preacher; an amazingly sane and balanced expositor; a sympathetic but strong counsellor; a saint with the human touch. His difficulties with the fourth-century Church forbid us to despair of ours: perhaps if we preached in his manner even without his eloquence, we might equip our people better to give an answer to the "fringers'.

Southbroom, Devizes. H. A. Blair.

Christian Humanism. By L. Bouyer. Translated by A. V. Littledale. Geoffrey Chapman. 10s. 6d.

The Cure of Human Troubles. By W. M. Watt. S.P.C.K. 15s.

The Conquest of Fear. By H. C. Robins. S.P.C.K. 1s.

Père Bouyer's book is addressed to Roman Catholics, and much

of it is to be understood in the context of assumptions which Anglicans do not generally share. Still, when account is taken of these, Bouyer's main theme is worth careful study by everyone who is concerned with the place of Christianity in our scientific age. His theme is the danger of the re-emergence of a new form of Modernism in the Roman Church, a danger which is due not so much this time to historical criticism as to the mental uncertainty of a turbulent age which is ready to accept the latest intellectual fashion. This new Modernism expresses itself in a re-interpretation of the traditional relationship of the Creation to the Cross, of dependence to freedom, of intellect to faith, of tradition to renewal, of action to contemplation, of self-development to asceticism. Bouyer very ably examines each of these pairs in turn and shows where the new interpretations conflict with Roman Catholic teaching.

The fundamental problem arises out of a new interpretation of the Christian doctrine of Creation to which theologians are being pressed by the evidence of human creativity in modern science. The co-operative creative activity of man with God is taking place outside the redemptive sphere of the Church, and this raises the question of the place of redemption in such a situation. The new Modernism finds a place for it by making it ancillary to the process or else by identifying the Mystical Body with the process itself. Bouyer's book shows what is involved in a failure to distinguish the Church from the social process and to emphasize the need for Christian detachment. He does not pause, however, to question the traditional Roman interpretation of this distinction and detachment in the light of the appearance of this new Modernism.

From the problem set by humanist achievement we pass to human troubles in Dr Watt's book. His purpose is to give a Christian diagnosis of these troubles in psychological terms, and to translate the Christian orthodox cure into the language that the modern scientifically trained man will understand. The trouble is personal and social disintegration, which is evidenced in disunity and insecurity and is occasioned by self and group consciousness. Reintegration takes place through a psychological process whereby the presentation of certain archetypes elicits a health-giving response from the psyche. A synthesis of these original archetypes was presented in the life of our Lord, which led and still leads to a release of libidinal activity.

It is a fascinating thesis, clearly stated and supported by an able social analysis which has its own independent value. The merit of the book is that it attempts to meet the problem of Christian communication with the scientific mind. On the other hand, there is no room in the thesis for an objective act of atonement which is essential to genuine Christian conversion. Moreover, one is left with the impression that one of two things is likely to happen to the psychologist for whom Dr Watt intends this book. Either he will find himself faced with the same temptation as Simon Magus of wanting this power because of its effectiveness in curing neurosis, irrespective of whether he accepts the faith or not, or else he will cease to be a psychologist for the time being and ask the same question as any other

man, namely, whether Christianity is true. That metaphysical answer the psychological interpretation of Christianity cannot give. If this book leads him to ask that question it will have achieved a great deal.

The Conquest of Fear by the Dean Emeritus of Salisbury is a description of how he himself has been enabled to overcome fear. It is a beautiful piece of writing coming from a pastoral mind, and the prayer and meditation at the end is worth a great deal. It should be available in church book stalls.

B. N. Y. Vaughan.

The Deanery,
Port of Spain,
Trinidad.

The Spiritual Genius of St Thérèse. By Jean Guitton. Translated by a Religious of the Retreat of the Sacred Heart. Geoffrey Chapman. 2s. 6d.

What is a Saint? By Jacques Douillet. Translated by Donald Attwater. Burns and Oates. 7s. 6d.

The Glorious Company. Lives of Great Christians for Daily Devotion. January–June. By Frederick C. Gill. Epworth Press. 10s. 6d.

Saint Serge et la Spiritualité Russe. By Pierre Kovalevsky. Éditions du Seuil. N.p.

Itinéraire Spirituel de Charles de Foucauld. By Jean-François Six. Éditions du Seuil. N.p.

The Life of St John of the Cross. By Crisógono de Jesús, O.C.D. Translated by Kathleen Pond. Longmans. 45s.

M. Guitton has succeeded admirably in stripping off one more layer of the sugar under which the genius of St Thérèse is still to a certain extent coated and stifled, to show us something of the "little wedge of iron", as Miss Sackville West once described her. The book, like the translation, is a trifle ponderous to begin with, but takes wings as the author comes to grips with Thérèse's sayings and doctrine. Her biblical insight into the trembling issues of the present moment provides a necessary and stimulating supplement to De Caussade's teaching on the same subject. It is doubtful whether we can go so far as to claim that she restored new meaning to the vocabulary of the spiritual life, but it is certain she must have brought a breath of fresh air and reality to the life of her order. Perhaps the wisest part of the book is the analysis of her teaching on the idea of effortless effort in the moral life, and the need to avoid that unblessed self-generated effort which M. Guitton calls "a kind of poison secreted by the will", leading only to tenseness and impotence. Certainly an honest half-crown's worth.

What is a Saint? is No. 46 in the Faith and Fact Series, designed to illustrate Catholic truth in a scientific age. Starting with an analysis of the meaning of holiness under the Old Covenant and its

final realization under the New, the most valuable part of the book, the author gives us a few examples of Christian sanctity, examining its motives, pre-conditions and fruits in turn. The second part of the book is a competent and readable history of the development of the primitive Roman martyrologies into the modern procedure of canonization, with some good things to say about saints as co-operators with Christ in the apostolate of the Church to-day. The translation suffers from occasional lapses into slang, and the rendering of St Francis' Hymn to the Sun is somewhat wooden. The definition of the Communion of Saints on p. 25 and the paragraph on mystical graces, prayer and holiness, on p. 62, are inadequate and misleading, and need re-writing in any future edition. The first section of the Select Bibliography, apart from the first title, is almost as unhelpful as it could be, and the most serious blemish in the book. "Natural" on p. 70 should surely read "supernatural".

Mr Gill's small manual of devotion provides succinct pen sketches of saints ancient and modern for the first half of the year. There is a wide and balanced choice here, and the author should be congratulated on avoiding all traces of unction in a book of this kind. Biblewise, mere fact is left to generate devotion. The obvious defect of the book is its microscopic type, which will seriously limit its usefulness among those most likely to value it.

M. Kovalevsky's résumé of the ethos and development of Russian spirituality, against the background of Russian history, is a wholly worthy addition to the miniature library of Spiritual Masters, in which it features as No. 16. The plates constitute an art gallery in themselves and are so good, so abundant and well chosen, that the text can be read more as a commentary than an independent history, complete though this is. George Meredith was wont to allow his publishers to print occasional critical lines of his novels in italics, so that they stand out like fire from the page. One such remark of the author similarly impresses itself on the mind as he traces the enormous influence of St Sergius: "he had acquired an extraordinary serenity and balance". This is a contribution to the ecumenical movement for which one can be truly grateful.

The date 908 on p. 17 should be 988; de prés on p. 61 should read de près; and the reference to Matt. 1 on p. 86 should read Matt. 7. 13.

It is salutary at intervals to be made to feel that all one's piety is so much atheism, and other peoples' atheism piety beside one's own religiosity. This is one effect of reading De Foucauld's conversion, minutely documented by Père Jean-François Six. Another is the realization of the strange similarities between the events and conditions leading up to this conversion and that of Augustine: in each case the same restlessness of intellect, the same lightning oscillations between longing and bitterness, hope and despair, search and disappointment, hatred and love of the Beloved Unknown; the same persistent background intercessions, and in both cases a great spiritual midwife. A third effect is to raise the question whether any man is converted who has not first hated God and all the symbols of him. If a soul cannot find itself without first losing itself, or lose

itself without dread and pain, what claim has a man to conversion who has not once wished to curse God and die? The most important thing a reviewer can say about a book of this sort is that it should be translated forthwith and read.

The life of St John of the Cross by the late Padre Crisógono de Jesús is probably the fullest now available to the Christian world, and the author has been well served by his translator. He produced a very good, though not quite a great book, marred as it is in places by a certain naivety, and heavily overladen with the recital of innumerable but barely significant facts. His subject only just succeeds in emerging as a person, mainly in the closing portrait of a mere eight pages, and the chapter on St John's works is no longer. The completely adequate life still waits to be written by the twentieth or twenty-first century Gerard Manley Hopkins.

Yet one should not be ungrateful for this book. It is a labour of unbounded love, invaluable as a work of reference, and in its English dress at all events a joy to handle. The plates are magnificent, and the statue by Hernández surely one of the loveliest things of its kind on earth. There is also a certain spiritual congruity, which the biographer would have appreciated, between the ineptitude that caused the saint's death and the fatuous incompetence that caused his own. There are slips and misprints on pp. 81, l. 38; 162, l. 21; 209, l. 1; 226, l. 19; and 303, l. 9.

J. K. Byrom.

Cheadle Hulme.

What is Christian Giving? By Brian Rice. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

"The inner group—parochial or diocesan—must, of course, prepare a budget. But don't go to your people with a budget. Gratitude to God, and not the inadequate budget, should be the motive for giving."

But, in fact, a mixture of motives has given rise to this booklet of 95 pages, in which the American scene is examined to throw light on why Americans give so generously, while in England it is hard to finance even basic church needs. One motive is simply the need of the local churches which has to be met somehow, and should be met in a responsible manner. The other motive, and here is stressed the American contribution, is the individual Christian's need of giving as a means of worship.

The keynote of the theme of the book is the stress on the second motive. Methods of raising money are noticed, including those of professional money-raising companies, but are all subordinated in favour of the "tithing" system and its motive of saving the giver rather than upholding the corporate body. The motives become mixed again when it is claimed that the corporate body will be the chief beneficiary.

The book is excellent in its insistence on the need to teach people to give, as a simple corollary to their Christian profession. It is less

excellent in the crude salvationism implied in the comment (p. 56), "Give when it hurts, should be our standard". For this is no standard at all; your careful and contriving man is hurt in giving a pound, while your heedless fellow is scarcely aware of giving five. The difference between them is not to be set down as Christianity.

H. C. Wallace.

Holm Cultram.

What About Nursing? By Joy Burden. S.P.C.K. 1959. 2s. 6d.

This booklet is written to help those who are considering taking up nursing as a career. It deals with the qualities required and the different types of training schools available. It gives a broad outline of the training and life of the student nurse and does not omit to mention some of the difficulties which may arise; but it tends to appeal to the emotions more than is necessary.

The whole of the second half deals in some detail with the prospects of the State Registered Nurse. This problem, I feel, does not confront the girl who is anticipating a nursing career in its preliminary stages. It would have been better if more space had been devoted to the daily life and prospects of the student nurse and less to the opportunities for the State Registered Nurse.

The booklet is helpful and pleasant even though it looks at the career through slightly rose-tinted spectacles.

Judy Pritchard.

Sutton-on-Derwent.

The Business of Criticism. By Helen Gardner. Clarendon Press. 15s.

Miss Gardner prefaces the three Riddell Memorial Lectures, already published (and justly praised) under the title of *The Limits of Literary Criticism*, with an earlier set of three lectures, "The Profession of a Critic". She steers a *via media* among the literary-critical schools, and her work is a happy illustration of the truth that there is no substitute for knowledge and intelligence, nor for those crucial manifestations of the Christianity of a critic, common sense and right feeling. I should like to hear her on Charles Williams. It would take too long to explain why, but it is not irrelevant to query one expression in this book: "the pious Burghley".

Deryck Hanshell, S.J.

Beaumont College,
Old Windsor.

Barriers to Unity. Edited by Michael Bruce. Faith Press. 15s.

The International League of Apostolic Faith and Order "seeks to promote understanding between Catholic-minded Christians of various communions for their mutual encouragement and support in

maintaining or recovering Apostolic Faith and Order". This book originated in a conference of I.L.A.F.O. held in 1957, but it is a collection of papers written as a result of the discussions held there rather than a gathering of the papers actually read.

In the editor's phrase, the book "aims at grasping the nettle of controversy". On the other hand, it is a real and positive attempt to restate such controversial issues as the Sacrifice of the Mass, sacramental Confession, the ministry and the nature of the Church in such a way as to remove from Protestant minds certain misconceptions with regard to them. Its aim is eirenic and not polemical. Not all the contributions achieve this. Father Rodzianko's chapter, for example, on "One and Catholic" loses much of its force by its nagging at both Rome and Protestantism, its misrepresentation of both of them, and its pushing of a particular viewpoint which would certainly not carry universal consent in Orthodoxy itself. (This paper would also lose much of its unintelligibility by an efficient editing of its English.) The Rev. Humphrey Green's paper on the Sacrifice of the Mass is, on the other hand, a model of eirenic writing. Coming as it does from so well known a Catholic theologian, Dr Mascall's paper on "The Sacraments of Non-Episcopal Bodies" is of first importance. It is true, as he himself says, that the position he outlines "needs amplification, careful scrutiny and, in all probability, a good deal of correction", but I venture to suggest that if he and others will amplify, scrutinize and correct, we will find that he had opened a new line of approach in the Catholic-Protestant dialogue likely to bear more fruit than any other.

Dr Gerritsen, who writes on "The Recovery of Episcopacy", is a leader of the "high church" movement in the Dutch Reformed Church, and well known to many Anglicans. He is the only representative of a Protestant Church who contributes to the book and pretends to represent no more than his own small group within Dutch Calvinism. His contribution deserves to be pondered seriously by those who are concerned to commend an episcopal ministry to non-episcopal churches. He is quite clear that episcopacy has nothing to commend it apart from its theological function in the Body of Christ. His final solution for the recovery of episcopacy in the Protestant Churches comes like a breath of clean air amid much of the verbiage that is written on the subject, though his qualified approval of the position of such *episcopi vagantes* as Friedrich Heiler must cause some misgiving.

This book is designed for two classes of reader: those on the Protestant side who are concerned for Christian unity, but often repelled by the way in which the Catholic case is presented, and those who are directly concerned with reunion negotiations. I only hope they will read it.

There is one serious misprint on p. 5, where "official" should read "unofficial".

Henry R. T. Brandreth, O.G.S.

Paris.

BOOK NOTES

The widespread interest that is at present being taken in the comparative study of religions, whether or not it is so called, is evidenced by the simultaneous appearance of three books which are addressed to the general reader. *The Concise Encyclopaedia of Living Faiths* (Hutchinson, 50s.) is the most substantial and the most handsomely produced with numerous colour and monochrome plates. The Editor, Prof. R. C. Zaehner, describes it as "a book that attempts to describe in brief compass those faiths which have withstood the test of time and which must, therefore, correspond to some fundamental need in man". The faiths are treated under two headings—"Prophecy" and "Wisdom". The former includes Judaism, Christianity (which is dealt with by different authors in five sections), Islam and Zoroastrianism; the latter includes Hinduism, Jainism, Buddhism (two sections), Shintō, Confucianism, and Taoism. Each faith is described by an appropriate authority, and the editor contributes an introduction and a conclusion. This is a volume that should be found in public libraries. Much the same ground is covered by a single author, Mr Huston Smith, in *The Religions of Man* (Frederick Muller, 4s.), though in briefer compass. This is a paper-back that owes its origin to a series of talks on American TV; the response to them revealed to Prof. Smith "a real hunger on the part of Americans to know the great faiths that have motivated and continue to motivate the peoples of the world". He wrote the book with a view to satisfying this desire, and it will go a considerable way towards doing so. *Religions of the Ancient East* (Burns and Oates, 7s. 6d.), as its title implies, is about the religions of Egypt and the Middle East as they were believed and practised in antiquity. It is a "Faith and Fact" book, and is written by E. Drioton, G. Conteneau and J. Duchesne-Guillemin. Where once the man sick of soul would turn to his pastor for help, he now tends to seek psychotherapeutic treatment. Dr Carl Michalson in *Faith for Personal Crises* (Epworht Press, 15s.) attempts "to enter into the current theological opportunity" by showing us the bond between theology and psychotherapy. "Faith", he declares, "is primarily man's access to an understanding of himself and his obligations"; and with this as lodestar he discusses the personal crises of life under such headings as "Guilt", "Marriage", "Death", etc. The style grates occasionally with its mixture of technical jargon (*implosion*) and current slang (a situation *has not jelled*), but the book contains many interesting quotations and an excellent index. Penguin Books have produced an attractive edition of *The Little Flowers of St Francis* (3s. 6d.), translated with an introduction by L. Sherley-Price. *A Bibliography for the Use of Teachers of Religious Knowledge*, fifth edition, 1959 (Institute of Christian Education, 2s. 6d.), maintains its value as a guide to the best available current literature. *Historical Atlas and Gazeteer* (O.U.P., 35s.) is Vol. XI of Arnold Toynbee's *A Study of History*. It contains a guide to all the geographical names and expressions with references both to the complete edition of the *Study* and to the abridgement by D. C. Somervell, and also 113 pages of maps. These last will be of considerable use in themselves, i.e. independently of the whole work. *Nationality and the Western Church before the Reformation* by I. P. Shaw (S.P.C.K., 7s. 6d.) contains the Maurice Lectures for 1956, given at King's College, London. Dr A. P. Shepherd in *Marriage was made for man: a study of the problem of marriage and divorce in relation to the Church of England* (Methuen, 8s. 6d.) submits the Convocation Resolutions of 1957 to a critical examination and proposes an alternative method by which the Church of England should tackle the problem. Both the critical and constructive parts of his thesis deserve serious study. One of his contentions is that the Eastern Church has been more faithful than the Western to the teaching of Christ.

PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY
BILLING AND SONS LIMITED, GUILDFORD AND LONDON

In the course of 1960 we plan to publish the following new books

---

Christian Community

J. V. LANGMEAD CASSERLEY, D.D.

16*s. net*

Bishop of London's Lent Book 1960
The Ladder of Temptations

Rev. Canon H. A. BLAIR

Cased 6s. 6d. net; Paper covers 4s. net

Puritanism and the Church Courts

R. A. MARCHANT, D.D.

63*s. net*

Commentary on the Sunday Lessons Vol. 2

Rev. Canon E. W. HEATON

25*s. net*

From Gore to Temple

Dr. A. M. RAMSEY (Archbishop of York)

21*s. net*

The Mount of Purification

EVELYN UNDERHILL

12*s. 6d. net*

Men of Wisdom Series

Socrates

M. SAUVAGE

Illustrated, Cased 10s. 6d. net; Paper covers 6s net

Calvin

A–M. SCHMIDT

Illustrated, Cased 10s. 6d. net; Paper covers, 6s. net

Many of these prices are provisional.

LONGMANS GREEN & CO. LTD.

A MONASTERY IN MORAY

Peter F. Anson — **30s net**

Pluscarden Priory, founded in 1230, was united with Urquhart Priory in 1453, and passed into lay hands in 1595. In 1945 ownership passed to the Benedictines of Prinknash, and the Priory is once again occupied by a colony of monks. On this bare outline, Mr Anson has exercised his well-known powers of telling a fascinating and fully documented story. A vivid light is thrown on the social and religious history of the Kingdom of Scotland.

THINK ON THESE THINGS

Francis L. Wheeler — **17s 6d net**

This book of readings will help many to appreciate anew the spiritual significance of the Church's round of Festival and Fast and, in addition, will provide users with spiritual counsel for their own spiritual progress. The readings, commendably brief, are sufficiently long for use by those who have little time for meditation, and the book presents an admirably coherent whole.

IS THE BIBLE INSPIRED?

A Seraph Book

J. Burnaby — **4s 6d**

For most people the traditional conception of biblical inspiration has been made impossible by the Higher Critics. What is to be jettisoned? The particular conception, or the whole idea of inspiration? Professor Burnaby examines modern Christian teaching about miracle, allegories, historical accuracy, faith, and morals, and then answers the question unhesitatingly and with sound reasoning.

MAN, GOD, AND PRAYER

H. Northcott, C.B. — **6s**

Fr Northcott's book on prayer has been widely used from the time of its original publication. It is no less useful to those who have travelled some distance in the way of prayer than to those just setting out on that way. Its appearance in *Seraph*-form will be welcomed.

HEBREWS AND THE SCRIPTURES

F. C. Synge — **7s 6d**

A provocative and stimulating book for students giving new insights into the mind of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews—possibly the most difficult of the Epistles for the modern mind to understand.

S • P • C • K